THE FONT UNCOVER'D FOR Infant-Baptiſme; OR AN ANSWER TO THE Challenges of the ANABAPTISTS OF *STAFFORD*,

Never yet Reply'd unto, though long ſince promiſed.

Wherein

The Baptiſme of all Church-Members Infants is by plain Scripture-proof Maintained to be the will of JESUS CHRIST; and many Points about Churches and their Conſtitutions are occaſionally handled.

By WILLIAM COOK late Miniſter of the Goſpel at *Aſhby-Delazouch.*

LONDON,

Printed by *A. Miller* for *Tho. Underhill* at the Anchor in *Pauls* Church-yard, near the little North-door. 1651.

TO

The Faithfull Servants of Christ,

and Lovers of the Truth in

STAFFORD

And the Parts adjacent, and others that are concerned in this Controversie of INFANT-BAPTISM, which desire to imbrace the Truth in Love:

Grace, Mercy and Peace be multiplied; through the knowledge of God the Father, and Christ Jesus our Lord.

Honoured and Beloved Inhabitants of *Stafford*,

AS your Wisdom, Resolution, Faithfulnesse and Activity to appear for the Truth, and contend for the Faith (shining forth in those whom God hath set in Civil Authority among you) in that great push of temptation; hath given occasion to many to glorifie God in your behalf, rejoice in your stedfastnesse, and pray for you, and (I doubt not) yielded comfort to your own consciences: so they have ingaged me to acknowledge my self your servant in Christ, and for the Truth, in this cause which doth so much concern the glory of Christ and comfort of Christians. I therefore, though conscious of mine own weaknesse, when I heard of those many lowd and proud challenges, that had been made by the contrary Party to dispute about this Subject, was willing, upon the advice and perswasion of some

of my Brethren, to undertake the Challenge, relying on the help of Chriſt and the goodneſſe of the Cauſe. And having received the Papers of the Challengers, in as ſhort a ſpace as I could, prepared this Anſwer (except ſome additions and explanations, which ſince its return to my hand, I thought meet to inſert, for the help of the ignorant, for whoſe ſake it is principally written) upon the giving in of a Copy, whereof a Reply was promiſed ſhortly by the Challengers. I waited long and heard nothing of my Papers, nor any Reply, untill a Letter came to my hands from ſome of principall note among you, dated Novemb. 11. expreſſing the contrary Parties boaſting of a Reply ready long ago, which was to be Printed with their Propoſitions, and mine anſwered. Whereupon I was then in that Letter, and ſince by word of mouth, deſired to Print mine Anſwer; leſt I ſhould be abuſed by others miſrepreſenting of the ſame. My anſwer was, that I would conſult with my Brethren, and if they ſhould think it meet, I would be willing to yield to you herein.

Ever ſince that time I have been caſt on a wandring and unſetled condition (as is well known,) far from my Study and Books. Yet when I could gain a little time with the help of the Bible, I added ſomething by way of explanation, for the help of meaner capacities that are not able to ſee the ſtrength of an Argument, or anſwer when it is barely propounded. Two Arguments more I have alſo added to the former number from one Scripture, whence I had only propounded one Argument at the firſt.

It may be ſome will demand, What is the reaſon that their Challenge is not accepted in a way of publique Diſpute, ſeeing they have urged it frequently, and confidently upbraided your Town and all Miniſters, that none would publiquely Diſpute with them? To this I Anſwer.

1. What hope of a publique Diſpute on good terms, to be undertaken by a Miniſter of Chriſt, when your own faithfull and peaceable Paſtour might not be ſuffered to preach the Goſpel to you, a people committed to his charge?

2. What incouragement can any rationall man have to Diſpute with ſuch as abhorre Syllogiſmes, which are the rationall way of diſputing?

3. What hope of finding out, or clearing the Truth by Diſpute, where there is no likelihood that the laws and rules of diſputing will

be

be observed with freedom, safety, peace and love, with the help of a Learned, Judicious and Impartiall Moderator.

4. *What likelihood of good by a Dispute, wherein impudencie, audaciousnesse and verbosity, passion, bitternesse and violence are like to bear sway?*

5. *What can a publique Dispute in such a case (which case there is too great cause to fear) be, but a sinfull abuse of pretious time, of peoples patience, and even of Scripture and reason it self?*

6. *Who sees not that the drift of these men is to turn Religion into a matter of contention, and to draw people together to vain-janglings and concertations, as heretofore they met together at Stage-plaies, Bear-baits and Cock-fights, which abuse What pious heart doth not abhorre?*

7. *It was judged that most or all these evils might farre better be prevented by calm considerate writing, wherein the passions of fear, anger, &c. and all tumults might be avoided, and reason might speak and be heard.*

8. *Yet if this way of discussing the truth shall not be satisfactory, and good grounds of hopes shall be given, that the afore-named evils may be prevented, I doubt not, but the Challenge will be accepted. Otherwise no faithfull Minister of Christ may, to satisfie the irrationall desires of some, and answer the insolencie of others, adventure on that, which will be by the judgement of the prudent, no better then a taking of Gods Name in vain, and exposing of himself to certain danger.* Paul *himself, though full of zeal for the Truth, was willing to yield to the Disciples and his Friends, perswading him not to adventure himself into the tumultuous Theater.* Act. 19. 30,31.

It were much to be wished, that those men which have but weak reason, neither knowing how to manage an Argument, nor capable of conviction thereby; but are taken with plausible expressions and big words, or drawn by hopes of honour, pleasure, gain, ease or liberty, into new waies, like children Carried about with every winde of doctrine, *would make more use of their sense (by which only it seems they live, making no use of faith or reason in this case) to observe the end and issue of these waies, into which they are so easily drawn.*

We need not go to Munster *or other parts beyound the seas to see the judgement of God on these men: Our own Country gives too*

many sad experiences thereof. I will only give one instance, of one whose name deserves to be written in the dust, and doth already stink throughout the Land, and therefore I will not stain my paper with it: Yet he is so notorious and infamous, that a short description of him will sufficiently put men in minde whom I mean. In Warwickshire *he appeared first, crying down in his Preaching the Ministry of* England, *and Infant-Baptisme: After that he proceeded to be a great Dipper; after that he became a Master of the Quakers, and would cast people into Trances and Revelations, as is credibly reported: Lastly he became Head of the Ranters, that abominable, rotten, blasphemous and hellish Rout.* Warwickshire *and the Counties adjacent know whom I speak of, and the truth at large of what I briefly touch. Yea this wretched man is notoriously known in the chief City of the Land; so true is that of the Apostle, speaking of hypocriticall flagitious Deceivers,* That have a form of godlinesse, but deny the power thereof: Which creep into houses, leading captive silly women laden with lusts, ever learning and never coming to the knowledge of the truth. But, *saith he,* their folly shall be made manifest to all men. *And again,* Wicked men and seducers wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived.

2 Tim. 3. 5,6,7, 9, 13.

It might seem strange that they who so much depend on the answers of providence in outward successe, as irrefragable arguments to demonstrate the goodnesse or badnesse of causes and persons, should not acknowledge and tremble at Divine providence, by this and many thousand such like spirituall plagues, warning all men that have any care of their souls, to beware those waies that lead thereto. But it is not strange that they thus prepostorously judge; for those whom God hath given up to a sensual judgement, a reprobate minde, and hard heart, do alike cry down those waies that are attended with outward disgrace and misery, in a course of strictnesse and conscientiousnesse, though accompanied with riches of spirituall graces, which usually is the lot of the godly; and admire and greedily embrace the waies of sin and licentiousnesse, which for a time visibly prosper in the world, though accursed from heaven with invisible and spirituall plagues, which is the common condition of the wicked.

It is a sad and shamefull thing that evil men should be more industrious, active and bold, to study, plead for, and promote errour and falshood, then Gods servants are for the maintaining of the truth;

and

and particularly that theſe men ſhould do more to caſt themſelves and their children, others and their poſterity out of Covenant; then the godly will do to clear to themſelves and others, theirs and their childrens intereſt in the Covenant; but it is ſo. The beſt ſee, know, beleeve and love, but in part: Whereas corruption, luſt and errour, wholly reign in every unſanctified man, and have too ſtrong a party in the moſt ſanctified. Divine truths and Evangelicall myſteries, are ſtrangers to our corrupt mindes, and receive but cold entertainment there. Errours and lies are connaturall to mankinde, and ſoon cloſed with; when men ſpeak lies they ſpeak of their own. Honours, pleaſures, and filthy lucre, fleſhly liberty and eaſe, have a mighty influence upon carnall hearts, to carry them on in promoting and receiving falſhood, and reſiſting and rejecting truth. Nothing but pure zeal for God, love of Chriſt and his truth, care of our own and brethrens ſouls, can ſtir up earneſtly and ſincerely to contend for the truth, eſpecially when it lies under outward diſcouragements, diſgraces and frowns from the world, and alas, how rare are theſe graces amongſt men, and how weak in the ſtrongeſt Chriſtians!

Yet ſurely in other reſpects, Holineſſe and truth (though as a ſpark of fire in the midſt of a ſea of corruption, or as a Pearl in the bottom of a dunghill, or as a little glimpſe of light under a dark chaos of naturall and acquired ſinne and ignorance) have the advantage, for being of a divine originall, they are of prevailing invincible power, and therefore beleevers that have this unconquerable truth in them, and on their ſide, cannot be excuſed if they do not ſtirre up the grace of God in them, and take care and pains that they may be able to contend for, and maintain the truth that was once delivered to the Saints; eſpecially in theſe times of ſo great light, wherein (beſides the Scriptures in a known Language, and plentifull publike Preaching,) in Catechiſmes and larger Treatiſes the Truth is ſo fully cleared. It may be that God hath as for other cauſes, ſo for the correction of our ſloth and careleſneſſe, ſuffered theſe Controverſies to break out, that he may quicken us to the more diligent uſe of all holy means to grow in grace and knowledge. If for this uſe, dear brethren, this my poor labour may be ſerviceable to you, or others to whom at your deſire (upon the conſent and approbation of my brethren in the Miniſtry) it may be made common, I have my deſire. But before I leave you, let me intreat you and others that may make uſe of it, that you will not content your ſelves with a ſlightly looking on it, but

be

be ſerious as the matter handled (concerning yours and your childrens intereſt in the Covenant of Grace requireth,) deſerves: howſoever in the manner you may finde ſundry imperfections in the inſtrument, yet let not that be any prejudice to the truth whereof God is the author. Becauſe I was forced at the firſt to quote Scriptures briefly for ſpeed, which their importunity called for, and ſince I have not writ them out at large to prevent bulkineſſe, which might deter many from looking on it; let me intreat you to turn over to every proof in your Bibles, and read and obſerve the ſame carefully; and if you would write them out in the margin or ſome paper, it might be time well ſpent; without pains and diligence no profiting can be expected; he that deals with a ſlack hand, will come to poverty, but the hand of the diligent maketh rich. Thus committing this ſervice and your uſe thereof to the bleſſing of God, deſiring that he may have the praiſe if you ſhall receive hereby any increaſe in the knowledge of the truth and ſtability therein, and that I may have the help of your prayers, who remain

Yours in Chriſt for the ſervice of your ſouls

to my power,

WILLIAM COOK.

AN

AN ANSWER

to two PAPERS, subscribed by

Henry Huggar and *James Brown*:

Wherein they endeavour to maintain their own Opinion and Practice of *Anabaptism*, and oppose the Practice of Baptizing INFANTS.

They begin their first Paper thus,

Gentlemen,

YOu having avoided publick dispute, by your selves so much prest for at first; and since rather paper conference: We to gratifie your desire herein, have written these few lines, hoping thereby to beget some discussion of the truth. Wherein we affirm, That the Baptism (or sprinkling) of Infants, whereby the National Churches of Spain, England, France *and* Rome, *&c. are constituted, and from thence called Christians and Christendom, is not the Baptism (or dipping) of Beleevers, which Christ Jesus ordained, and his Disciples practised for the right constituting of Churches under the Gospel, whereby they rightly became, and were truly called Christians.* H.H. and J.Br.

Answer.

IN this your stating of the Question, divers things must be animadverted that you deceive not your selves and others, through darkning the truth by words without knowledge. *Ans.*

1. Here you take it for granted that we hold, That by the Baptizing or sprinkling Infants, Churches are constituted: This we deny. For

1. As faith or interest in Christ, or the Covenant of grace, constitutes a Christian; for the joint and orderly profession of faith and interest in that Covenant, or Gods owning a people to be his in Covenant, is that which constitutes them a Church.

2. Baptism is not essential to the constituting of a Church, being but adventitious or additional, as a sign or pledge of peoples admission into the Church. The penitent thief on the Cross was a true Beleever though unbaptized, and a multitude of such penitent ones jointly professing Christ should be a true

Act.7.38. Church, though they wanted opportunity to be Baptized, as that Penitent did.
Iosh.5.5,6. The *Israelites* in the wilderness were a true Church, though they wanted Circumcision for fourty years.

3. This Church (or these Churches) of *England*, received its (or their) constitution in or anon after the Primitive times, when by the Ministry of the word, some were converted from heathenism to Christianity; at which time we grant persons of years were Baptized upon their profession of faith, or repentance, and for they and their children received into Covenant. As *Abraham* Gen.12.4. at the first setting up of a Church, with a seal of admittance thereinto in his Gen.15.6. Gen.17.11, family, was Circumcised when he had professed or declared his repentance, 3,4,&c.7. faith and obedience, and then his children and posterity were Circumcised, whiles Infants, by vertue of the Covenant into which they were taken with their fathers. Now that being the first constitution of a Church in this Land which never yet was overthrown, though many waies depraved, through Anti- 2 Thes.2.4. christs usurpations (of whom it was foretold that he should sit in the Temple of God for a time,) but being after, through the rich mercy of God repaired, it hath continued still the same Church, having been never rased to the foundation; and so we need not a new constitution, and therefore we deny that our Church was constituted by Infant-baptism, any more then the Church of *Israel* was constituted by Infant-circumcision.

2. Whereas you say, that *National-Churches are constituted by Infant-baptism* Ans. *or sprinkling*. *Ans.*1. I know none that you oppose to plead for the constitution of National-Churches by Infant-baptism. 2. Though we boast not of National-Churches, nor is there any necessity that the mention of National-Churches should come into this dispute, yet are we not ashamed of the name of a National-Church: But seeing you urge it upon us as odious, we desire you, with us, to consider these things.

Gen.22.18. 1. Did not God promise to *Abraham*, that all the Nations of the earth should Gen.12.2. be blessed in his seed, *viz.* Jesus Christ. And how can Nations be blessed but by Psal.2.8. being made Churches? as that one Nation which descended from *Abraham*, was blessed by being a Church and people of God. Hath not God promised to give Ps.22.27,28, to Christ the Nations for his inheritance, and utmost parts of the earth for his Isa.49.23. possession; and that all the ends of the earth, and kindreds of the Nations shall Isa 52.14,15. turn to the Lord and worship before him? That Kings shall be nursing fathers, Mat.28.19, & Queens nursing mothers to the Church? And that Christ Jesus, whose visage Rev.11.15. and form was marred (with his bloud trickling down the same, when crowned Rev.21.24, with thorns, nailed to the Crosse, and pierced into the heart) shall sprinkle 26. many Nations? Did not Christ bid his Apostles go into all Nations, make Disciples and Baptize? Was it not foretold that the Kingdoms of the world should become the Kingdoms of God and his Christ; and that the saved Nations should walk in the light of the *New-Jerusalem*; and that the Kings of the earth should bring their light to it, and should bring the glory and honour of the Nations to it? Why then should the name of National-Church be so odious?

1, 2. And surely if 1. A company of Beleevers in one house have been justly called a Church (domestical) *Rom.*16.15. 1 *Cor.*16.19. *Col.*4.15. *Phil.*2. 2. 2. And if the number of Beleevers in a smal Village or Town, may be called a 3. Church (Congregational) *Rom.*16.1. 3. And the multitude of Beleevers in

one

one City imbracing the truth in ſo great number that no one room or place could contain them all at once for the ordinary orderly edifying adminiſtration of Gods Ordinances, may be called the Church of a City, or Claſſicall, as the Church of *Jeruſalem*, which increaſed into many thouſand, yea many ten thouſand, and yet was but one Church, *Act.*2.44.47. *Act.*5.14,15. & 6.1. *Act.*21.20. 4. And multitudes of Beleevers ſcattered in many and ſeveral countries, are ſtill the flock (and Church) of God, and an holy Nation, 1 *Pet.*2.1. with *chap.*2.11. and *chap.*5.2. 1 *Cor.*15.9. 5. And if the whole company of the faithfull on earth, conſiſting for the moſt part of many particular viſible Churches, may be called the Church (Oecumenical) *Mat.*16.18. 1 *Cor.*12. 28. 6. Laſtly, If all the Beleevers in heaven and earth, comprehending the militant and triumphant Church, may yet in a more comprehenſive ſenſe be called the Church Catholick, *Heb.*12.23. I think no good reaſon can be given why men ſhould make it ſo ſhy without ſcorn or reproach to call the faithfull in a whole Nation (eſpecially when the whole Nation doth generally profeſs the truth) a National-Church.

κατ' ἐκκλησίαν. &c. 4. 5. 6.

3. The National-Church was not conſtituted by Infant-baptiſme, but by the preaching of the Goſpel God was pleaſed to call ſome in the Primitive times in this land, and they became a Church, which was the firſt conſtitution of this Church. Afterward the leaven of the Goſpel ſeaſoning the whole lump, and that little grain of muſtard ſeed growing up into a great tree; and the Primitive Beleevers of this Land increaſing into a Nation, as *Abrahams* family did; the Church did grow up into a Nation, as was ſaid before; National, Oecumenical, Domeſtical or Congregational, being accidental, not eſſential to a Churches conſtitution or continuance.

Mat.13.32, 33. Ezek.16.13.

Thirdly, Whereas you ſay, *The National Churches of* Spain, England, France *and* Rome, *were conſtituted by ſprinkling of Infants*: I anſwer,

1. This is a poiſonous inſinuation, whereby the Church of *England* is put by you into the ſame condition with the Churches of *Rome, Spain, France*, &c. wherein you do not only wrong Gods holy people (which have ſtriven, and continue ſtriving for Reformation againſt Antichriſt) in matching them with the popiſh rabble, and ſlander thoſe Miniſters and Ordinances of Chriſt amongſt us (by whoſe means, if you have any knowledge of Chriſt and his truth, you have received the ſame) by equalling them with popiſh Miniſters and ſuperſtitions; but alſo blaſpheme God himſelf, at whoſe call and through whoſe grace we have come out of *Babylon*, have attained ſome, and breath after more Reformation. How will Chriſt take it that his people and Churches are thus compared with the ſlaves and Synagogues of Antichriſt!

2. Yet we are not aſhamed to own that which is of God amongſt the *Italians, Spaniards* and *French*. Shall we reject the Scriptures of the old Teſtament, or be equalled with the Jews, becauſe we embrace them as Gods word, which the Jews alſo profeſſe to do? Or muſt we caſt off the Scriptures of the Old and New Teſtament, and many precious truths gathered out of them, becauſe profeſſed by the Papiſts, who yet overthrow by many falſe doctrines and ſuperſtitions what truths they profeſſe? no ſure. Neither are we to think the worſe of Infant-baptiſm, becauſe it is uſed amongſt them.

3. Yea, we make no doubt but that if in *Italy, Spain* and *France*, they would hold only that in doctrine worſhip and practice which is agreeable to Gods

word, even the holy Scripture, which they profeſſe to imbrace with us, and caſt away ſuperſtitious idolatry and impieties contrary thereunto, reforming according to the word; God would own them for his Churches, neither ſhould they need a new conſtitution or new Baptiſme, any more then new Scripture. They have added indeed to Scripture and Baptiſm of their own; but let them repent of, and caſt away their additions, and keep that which is of God in judgement, practice and worſhip, according to the Scriptures which are amongſt them, and they become forthwith true and good Churches. The Church of *Judah* after it had fallen to idolatry, by caſting away that idolatry in the time of *Aſa, Jehoſaphat, Hezekiah* and *Joſiah*, was acknowledged a true and good Church without new conſtitution. Nay more, if backſliding *Iſrael*, after her many abominations, had returned to God when they had lien long in idolatry, God would have received them as his people without new Circumciſion.

Ier. 3. 1, 2. & 4. 1.

Fourthly, Whereas you ſay, *From this Infant-Baptiſm they are called Chriſtians or Chriſtendom*, You do not prove it, We deny it, and aſſert That we are called Chriſtians or Chriſtendom from our faith in Jeſus Chriſt and the profeſſion thereof, and from our intereſt in the Covenant of Grace which God hath made with us in Chriſt the Mediatour exhibited; yet granting that Baptiſm is the badge of our Chriſtianity, but not that which conſtitutes Chriſtians. What they of *Rome* or *Spain* ſay, we paſſe not.

Fifthly, Whereas you ſay or imply, *Baptiſm is dipping* (in your ſenſe) and call it ſprinkling (by way of ſcorn) in our ſenſe, and would imply that Chriſt ordained, and his Apoſtles practiſed dipping, or as others expreſſe it, douſing over the head, not infuſion or ſprinkling: We wiſh you to prove it if you can, either from the proper ſignification of the word, or from the nature of the Ordinance, or from the hiſtorical relation of the Apoſtles practice or otherwiſe. We finde that the word βαπτίζω ſignifies to waſh or bedew, or imbrew lightly, whether by infuſion of, or dipping into any liquid thing with a light touch; but that it ſhould ſignifie only dipping or douſing, the uſe of the word will not allow.

Mark 7. 4. ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσωνται, βαπτισμοὺς ποτηρίων. Mat. 3. 11. ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί.

1. It is uſed to ſignifie the ceremonial waſhing of cups, pots, brazen veſſels, or tables, which may be as well done by infuſion or pouring water upon them, as by immerſion or diping into the water, yea in ſome of them much better.

2. The ſame word is alſo uſed to ſignifie Chriſts baptizing with the holy Ghoſt and with fire. This cannot be ſo underſtood that Chriſt ſhould dip or douſe men into the holy Ghoſt and fire, but that in the Primitive times the holy Ghoſt ſhould be poured upon them, as the texts in the margin ſhew, and that Chriſt would in after times pour his Spirit ordinarily on his people, which Spirit, in reſpect of operation, is compared to fire, as giving light, heat, &c.

See the accompliſhment of this Prophecie, Act. 2 v. 3. & 17, 18. Act 10. 44 & 11, 15, 16. Luk. 12. 50. Βάπτισμα ἔχω βαπτισθῆναι. Mat. 20. 22. τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι, βαπτισθῆναι.

3. This word is uſed to ſignifie Chriſts death, wherein his bloud was poured forth and ſprinkled on himſelf, and he waſhed in his own bloud. I have, ſaith he, a Baptiſm to be baptized with, and again, *Are you able to be baptized with the Baptiſm that I am baptized with?*

Iſa. 63. 1, 3.

4. This word is alſo uſed to ſignifie Chriſts execution of Juſtice on his enemies, he being compared to a mighty warriour, which with wounding and ſlaying his enemies, is beſprinkled with their bloud, which ſpouts out of their body; when they are gaſhed and pierced by him. Our Tranſlators render that

in

in the *Revelation*, having his garments dipped in bloud: But it may be well read as that in *Isaiah*, ſprinkled with bloud. For warriours do not uſe to dip or douſe their garments in their enemies bloud lying on the ground, but well may they have their garments beſprinkled therewith as it guſheth out of their bodies being wounded by them. Rev.19.13.

2. As for the nature, uſe and end of Baptiſm, it is to ſignifie the pouring of the bloud and ſpirit of Chriſt on our ſouls for regeneration, remiſſion of ſins and ſanctification, wherein we are not ſaid to be dipped or douſed into Chriſts bloud or ſpirit, but to be ſprinkled therewith, or to have them poured upon us, *Heb.9.13,14. chap.12.24. 1 Pet.1.2. Iſa.44.3. Act.2.18.* So that Prophecie of Chriſts beſprinkling many Nations, *Iſa.52.15.* may be underſtood of his ſprinkling them with his bloud (which having ſpilled, he was ſo deformed, more then any man, *ver.14.*) for juſtification, and his Spirit (which by his truth he purchaſed) for ſanctification. The ſcope of the text and coherence ſpeaking of Chriſts ſufferings and the fruits thereof, confirm the interpretation as moſt natural and proper.

3. As for the relation which the Scripture makes of the manner of baptizing, Sometimes indeed it ſpeaks of baptizing at the river *Jordan*; but how improbable is it that they ſhould go into that mighty ſtream, which could not be paſſed over ſafely on foot (without a miracle) and there be dipped with extream danger of drowning. 2. We reade of baptizing in a City, divers thouſands in one day, without any mention of their going forth to any great water to be dipped. 3. We reade of baptizing a whole houſhold in a City in the deep night, without the leaſt intimation of their going forth to a river or any great water to be dipped, which if you conſider well, it may be you will not be ſo confident in calling baptizing, dipping. Ioſh.3.17. 2 King.5.8, & 14. Act.2.41.

Sixtly, You ſay that *This baptizing or dipping of Beleevers was ordained of Chriſt and practiſed by the Diſciples for the right conſtitution of true Churches.* This you ſpeak as your own ſenſe. *Anſ.* This opinion was confuted before, and by that which follows it ſhall further appear, that neither Baptiſm nor diping is eſſential to the conſtitution of a true Church.

Seventhly, You ſay or imply, This baptizing or dipping is that whereby they became, and were truly called Chriſtians. *Anſ.* This is falſe, that men cannot be right Chriſtians without your dipping: Yea though we underſtand it of true Baptiſm, for faith or intereſt in Chriſt properly maketh Chriſtians. Being intereſted in Chriſt, though we ſhould be hindered by death or other providence from Baptiſme, yet we are true Chriſtians, as the thief on the Croſſe. Thoſe three thouſand mentioned in the *Acts*, when they had beleeved, were Chriſtians, even before they were baptized; ſo *Philip* before he came to the water. Baptiſm is rather an effect or conſequent, then a cauſe or antecedent of our Chriſtianity. People are rightly baptized becauſe Chriſtians, not Chriſtians becauſe baptized. Act.2.39,& 40

2. Neither were men hence at firſt called Chriſtians, becauſe baptized; for many thouſands had been baptized a long time before they were called Chriſtians: For whereas great multitudes had been baptized by *John* the Baptiſt, and more by the Diſciples of Chriſt before his death, and many thouſands alſo after his aſcenſion, at *Jeruſalem*, *Samaria* and elſewhere. Beleevers were not called Chriſtians until a good time after the Perſecution and diſperſion at *Jeruſalem*. Mat.3.5,6. Joh.4.1,2. See Act 2.38. & 3.10 the 7 chap.

Act.11.26. *rusalem.* For the faithfull were first called Christians at *Antioch*, where *Paul* and *Barnabas* had taught an whole year, and the number of Disciples was mightily increased, there is not the least intimation that Baptism or dipping gave them the name of Christians, but rather their famous profession of Christ. Thus much for particulars observable in the main proposition.

Eightly, From the whole proposition in respect of the matter, let it be noted, that besides your implicit fastning on us some things which we own not; and asserting as your own some things which you neither have nor can prove. The whole state of the Question is mistaken by you. You speak of Baptism which is for the constitution of Churches, whereas the Question is, What Baptism is to be used amongst us, who are a Church (or Churches) constituted already? We grant that to the first constituting of Churches amongst Jews or Infidels, which were never a Christian people, a Profession of repentance, faith or obedience must be made by men upon the preaching of the Gospel, that they and their children may be accepted into Covenant and baptized. As *Abraham* professed his faith before that he and his family were circumcised, but after that his children were circumcised, without requiring of actual faith and repentance from them, as precedaneous to Circumcision. They that will constitute new Churches amongst Infidels, ought as we judge, first to require actual faith and repentance of that people before they admit them and their seed as members of the Church. But whatsoever you think of us, we Christians in *England* know that we were through Gods grace a Church constituted long ago, whose defects and corruptions, though many, yet have not been inconsistent with the being of a Church; neither (such hath been the indulgence of our Lord Jesus Christ, the head and King of the Church) were we ever unchurched. If you will go and preach among *Jews, Turks* and infidels, and make it appear that you have a commission for it; we will not gainsay your constituting of Churches amongst them, and baptizing Professors of faith. But in the mean space let me advise you to take heed, lest whiles you talk of constituting Churches amongst Gods people, Satan use you as his instrument to overthrow Churches, by subverting souls, and whole houses, through speaking things you ought not for filthy lucre sake; as he did those noted in the margin.

Act.15.3. 2 Tim.3.6. Tit.1.11.

Ninthly, Let it be also observed, in the form of your propounding the whole state of the Question, that you which would be accounted great disputers and discussers of the truth, laying down a negative Proposition (as is evident to any that can discern a negation from an affirmation) in propounding it say we affirm---- when indeed you deny. Will not these so grosse mistakes, in the parts and the whole, the matter and manner of this main question stated by you, give just cause to judge that you are such men as those of whom the Apostle speaks in these words, *Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, a good conscience and faith unfeined, from which some having swerved, have turned aside to vain jangling, desiring to be teachers of the law, understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm?*

1 Tim.1.5,6,7.

H.H ℣.B. Whereas you say, *If it be, we desire you to prove it by plain Scriptures.*

Ans. We have nothing to do to prove that which we never affirmed; but you falsly father upon us (as it may seem) that you may fight with your own shadow. But we shall by Gods assistance prove, upon solid Scripture grounds, That the Infants of Christians, which are members of a constituted Church

(or

(or Churches) have right to the Covenant of grace, and so to Baptism the seal of entrance into the Covenant; and that it is agreeable to Gods word that constituted Churches should be continued by baptizing of children that are members thereof.

But first let us hear what you say for your way. You proceed thus,

That the Baptisme of beleeving men and women by us practised, is the Baptism of Christ, we prove by these Scriptures. H.H. J.B.

Ans. For the answering of your Scripture-proofs, taken from Christs command and the Apostles practice; I will first propound some things in general to be considered, secondly make answer to the several Scriptures.

1. I answer therefore, That neither any nor all these Scriptures do prove plainly, positively, immediatly and directly, without consequence or syllogism (which I take to be your meaning when you call for plain and positive Scripture) which I have heard that some of your way abhor and protest against, that the Baptism practised by you is the Baptism of Jesus Christ. In none of these Scriptures it is expressely said, "The dipping of beleeving men and women, practised by *Henry Hugger* and *James Brown*, is the Baptism of Jesus Christ. Nor do we reade in the Evangelists, Go *Henry Huggar* and *Ja. Brown*, teach all Nations and baptize, *&c.* Nor do we reade that Christ gave a command to you two to preach the Gospel to every creature: Nor do we finde in the Acts of the Apostles, that *H.H.* and *J.B.* said to the *Jews*, Repent and be baptized; or that the *Samaritans* heard you two preaching; or that the *Eunuch* went down with you to the water; or that the *Jaylour* or *Crispus* the Ruler of the Synagogue were baptized by you or either of you. If you have any plain positive Scriptures mentioning your selves, you may produce them. Neither have you cause to take it ill to be urged thus: Seeing that you call for plain and positive Scripture without syllogism or consequence, to prove that children or infants by name should be baptized or sprinkled, why may not we require of you, plain and positive Scripture without syllogism or consequence, that *H.H.* and *J.Br.* should dip men and women? When you shew us expresse Scripture for the one, we will for the other.

2. "But it may be you will say, It will follow by good consequence from these Scriptures, that your Baptism is the Baptism of Christ.

Ans. 1. It is well if you be not afraid of syllogisms, consequences and argumentation. 2. Yet you have drawn no syllogisms nor arguments hence, and untill we see them we cannot answer them. 3. If you take liberty to use reasonings and consequences, you cannot rationally deny to us the like liberty. 4. If you will have these Scriptures brought home by any just consequence, for the proving of your Baptism to be the Baptism of Christ, you must undertake an hard task; for beside your skill in Logick, *&c.* you must either prove your selves Apostles or Evangelists, for to such were these commands given, and of such were these histories; and that you have power and authority to preach to the whole world, power to speak with strange tongues to any Nation whatsoever, and to work miracles, and that you ought to preach to none, but (or at least principally) to *Jews* and infidels, not building on others foundations, for these things belonged to those first founders of Churches: Or else at least you must prove that you are Pastors or Teachers (whom God hath appointed to succeed those extraordinary primitive Ministers, who were imployed in founding and

1. 2. 3. 4.

Mat. 28. 19. 20. Mar. 16. 15. 16, 17. Act. 2. & 8. Rom. 16. 25.

con-

Ephes.4.11, 12,13,14. constituting Churches,) which are to build on the Apostles foundation, for perfecting of the Saints, set apart for the work of the Ministry, and for edification of the mysticall body of Christ. And if so, you must make it appear,

Act.14.23. 1 Tim.3.1,2, 3,4,5,10. 2 Tim.4.14. & 5.22. Tit.1.7,8,9. Act.20.28. 1 Tim.4.13, 14,15. that upon due trial and examination of your gifts, and fitness in point of knowledge and holiness, you have been set apart to that Office, by the approbation or imposition of hands of the Presbytery, for that is the Gospel-order. You must make it appear also that you have a Flock to oversee and watch over, and that you give your selves wholly to reading, meditation and study, and that you fully discharge your Ministry in the Flock of Christ; if you will with any comfort to your seives, and satisfaction to others that are godly and judicious; apply the Scriptures which you have cited to your selves. Besides, if you be Apostles, why do you build on others foundations? If Pastours, what talk you of constituting Churches, as if that were your work?

3. The reason is not in all things the same of a Church to be constituted, and of a Church constituted already, as I have shewed before in the example of *Abraham:* when his family was to be made a Church, under the dispensation of the Covenant sealed by Circumcision, upon his professed faith and repentance, he was circumcised with his whole family; and after this his Domesticall Church grew up into a National; his posterity being acknowledged members of the Church by Circumcision in Infancy, were not to stay for Circumcision untill they actually beleeved, after *Abrahams* example. The same course was

Exod.12.48, 49. taken with Proselytes, they at first were to professe faith, and afterwards their children to be circumcised in Infancy. In like manner in the New Testament,

Act.16.14,15, & 31,32,33, 34 when Governours of families were baptized, their whole families were baptized with them; of which hereafter. When men are infidels, they and their seed are aliens from the Common-wealth of *Israel*; and therefore must actually repent and beleeve before they and their children be admitted to the Covenant: But having by faith laid hold on the Covenant for themselves and theirs, their children are interested therein, at least externally, so far as to have right to the seal of entrance. There is not the same reason of the foundation and superstruction in all things, nor of planting trees and their growing up and nourishing. Indeed at the first planting of a Park, Vineyard or Orchyard, there must be a rooting or fastning of the first stock, stemme or branch immediatly in that ground or grafting stock, but afterward it is not necessary or fit that every sprig that sprouts forth thence should be cut off, and immediatly rooted in the earth; this course would hinder growth and fruitfulnesse. So the first receivers of the Gospel being planted into Christ, his Covenant and Church by faith, do successively convey (according to the tenour of the Covenant of grace) the blessing to their children (whiles succeeding parents, the offspring of those first Beleevers continue in the faith,) so far forth, as that their Infants have right to the Covenant (and seal of entrance) which runs thus, *I will be thy God and the God of thy seed after thee.* Thus it was unquestionably from *Abrahams* unto Christs time; the Apostle using the like similitude tells us that some of the Jews were broken off from the Olive tree by unbelief for a time, else they might with their seed still have partaked of the root and fatnesse of the Olive tree as before, which priviledge doubtlesse those that were not broken off by unbelief, did retain; and these unbeleevers when they shall return to Christ by faith, shall recover; and the beleeving Gentiles being

Gen.17.7.

Rom.11.17.

for

for the present planted in, in their room, must enjoy. The same Apostle saith that the beleeving Gentiles are fellow-heirs and of the same body with beleeving Jews, and so partakers of the same priviledges. It is true some things are common to the constituting and founding of a Church, with its continuance and superstruction, these must be alike observed in both cases: some things are proper to each; and here heed must be taken of confounding these, lest if we be alwaies laying the foundation, we never come to perfection. Ephes. 3 5. Heb. 6. 1, 2.

4. Whereas your practice is to perswade beleeving parents to forbear baptizing of their children, untill they can actually repent and beleeve; Where do you prove that Christ commanded or his Apostles practised this? I am sure those Scriptures which you set down, mention no such thing. The Apostles according to Christs command, preached to Jews and infidels, and having converted them, baptized them with their families; but no where bid them keep their children, untill they professe their repentance and faith, and then baptize them; this you practise without any Scripture-warrant.

5. Neither do any or all these Scriptures prove, that it is according to Christs institution, to baptize or dip those which have been already baptized Into the Name of the Father, Son and holy Ghost (which is your practice) these Scriptures I am sure contain no such command or practice.

If you say you finde a warrant for rebaptizing. *Act.* 14. 3, 4, 5. I answer, *Ob.*

According as the Original will well bear it, in the History the fourth and fifth verses may be so understood, as to contain but a relation made by *Paul* (rehearsed by *Luke*) concerning the nature of *Johns* Baptism, for the satisfying of those twelve Disciples, that whereas they had been baptized by *John*, that was sufficient in respect of the outward sign; For thus saith *Paul*, *John* truly baptized the Baptism of repentance, saying to the people that they should beleeve in him which was to come, even Jesus Christ: But they which heard him (or the hearers *viz.* of *John*) were baptized into the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ; meaning, not only those twelve, but all *Johns* hearers as they were taught by him to beleeve in Christ, for they were baptized by him into the Name of Christ; so that we must not judge that in the fifth verse *Luke* makes relation of what was done at that present time by *Paul*, to those twelve disciples, but sheweth how *Paul* continues his speech to satisfie them and others present, that the Baptism which they had received of *John*, was the true Baptism, in the Name of Christ, so that they needed no more external and material Baptism; nor had any cause to scruple the truth of their Baptism. And this reading is confirmed by these considerations, 1. The conjunctions μὲν and δὲ in the beginning of the fourth and fifth verses, argue strongly, that those two verses make up but one compleat sentence, and so that it is the continued speech of *Paul* holding on his discourse concerning *Johns* doctrine and Baptism, as suitable, both of them referring to Christ; the one leading, the other dedicating people to him. 2. Whereas our Translatours render the beginning of the fifth verse, *When they heard this*, it may be more properly read so, according to the Original [*But the hearers*, or *they which had heard*, or *when they had heard*, *they were baptized*,] the word *(this)* is not in the Original. 3. This reason also may be added, If *Johns* Baptisme was not sufficient, but that they must have a new Baptism, it will follow that *Johns* Baptism was not the same for substance with Christs and his Disciples, which is not to be granted, seeing Christ *Ans.* 1. 2. ἀκούσαντες δὲ 3.

was baptized by *John*: And as our Saviour ſhewed his fellowſhip with the Jews Church, by receiving the ſame Circumciſion which they had; ſo he ſhewed his communion with the Chriſtian Church by receiving the ſame Baptiſm for ſubſtance with them.

2. Others underſtand the fifth and ſixth verſes to ſpeak of the ſame things, and hold that theſe men were indeed baptized again; yet not with water, but with the holy Ghoſt, by the laying on of hands, according to that of *John*, *I indeed baptize you with water, but he that cometh after me ſhall baptize you with the holy Ghoſt and fire.* And agreeably to thoſe relations in the *Acts*, of the Spirit in the ſhape of fire deſcending on perſons, according to that prediction; and at other times given by laying on of hands, a good time after Baptiſm, and thus underſtood it will make nothing for you.

Mat. 3,11. Act. 2 3,4. Act. 10,44. & 11,15,16. Act. 8 15,16, 17.

3. If we ſhould grant it to be underſtood of different baptiſms with water, it will make nothing for you. For the Learned which hold that, ſay, that *Johns* Doctrine, Miniſtry and Baptiſm were introductory to Chriſts, and though higher then the Miniſtry of the Prieſts and Prophets, yet inferiour to the full Goſpel-Miniſtry. Now you cannot ſay that the caſe is here alike, and that our Miniſtry is ſubſervient and introductory to yours by Gods appointment, as *Johns* was to Chriſts.

Mat. 11,11.

4. This Scripture will do you no ſervice, if it be granted that thoſe men were baptized again, for they had not ſo much as heard if there were any holy Ghoſt: but thoſe whom you rebaptize were baptized into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Ghoſt, and were often inſtructed in the doctrine of the bleſſed Trinity. If you reply, Though theſe whom you dip had heard of the holy Ghoſt, yet they had never felt the work of the holy Ghoſt in them. I anſwer, That indeed is too probable, at leaſt in many of them, that becauſe they have plaid the hypocrites ſo long, being deſtitute of the ſpirit of ſanctification, and right diſcerning, through their own fault, they are thus miſerably given over to ſtrong deluſions, to beleeve lies, ſeparating themſelves from Gods humble people, and powerfull Ordinances; becauſe they are ſenſuall not having the ſpirit.

Act. 19,2. 2 Theſ. 2,10, 11,12. Jud. v. 19.

5. Yea though we ſhould grant that theſe were baptized again by the Apoſtle here, it was for this end, that by laying on of *Pauls* hands, they might receive the gift of the holy Ghoſt, with ſpeaking ſtrange tongues and prophecying, *verſ.* 6. This you cannot procure for them whom you rebaptize. Therefore plead not this place for your practice.

Now I come to conſider of the particular Scriptures which you bring. Firſt ſay you, *The commands of Chriſt*, Mat. 28.19,20. *Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Ghoſt*, &c. Mat. 16.15,16. *And he ſaid unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the Goſpel unto every creature, He that beleeveth and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved, he that beleeveth not ſhall be condemned.*

Anſ. To theſe Scriptures I anſwer three things. 1. They make nothing for your opinion and practice: For 1. Theſe commands were given to the Apoſtles, who were to lay the foundation of Chriſtian Religion, where Chriſt had not been heard of, as is plain in theſe very Scriptures, and by the example of *Paul* and other Apoſtles, acting by vertue of this Commiſſion: But you do not ſo, but boaſt in things without your meaſure, even of other mens labours, and

Rom. 15,21, 23. 2 Cor. 10,15, 16.

and boast in other mens Lines of things made ready to your hands; as the Apostle implies the false teachers at *Corinth* did. It is well known that you go to them which are by profession Christians already. 2. Though these Scriptures command to make Jews and Gentiles disciples and baptize, or to preach to all creatures and baptize, yet they forbid not baptizing those that are not capable of outward teaching and preaching to for the present. If you gather from the order of the words, that none but those that beleeve (actually and personally) must be baptized, you may as well gather none but those that are baptized shall be saved; for as in the text, beleeving goeth before baptizing, so baptizing goes before saving. Nay, though Christ saith peremptorily, *He that beleeveth not shall be condemned*, you will not I think hence conclude that all Infants which you say cannot beleeve; must necessarily perish in their Infancy; though this might far more probably be concluded from the text, then what you would conclude. The words therefore are not to be taken so generally, as to admit of no restriction, but must be limited according to the subject-matter, *viz.* that when professed infidels, such as the Apostles were sent to, are preached to, they must be made disciples and beleeve, and then be baptized, and such as are quite out of Covenant, and have no means of being taken into Covenant but by actual faith of their own, must be condemned if they beleeve not. 2 Cor. 10. 5, 16.

2. These Scriptures make much against you, for while you urge them for your warrant, you not only use no endeavours to go to the poor Nations and Heathens to preach the Gospel to Jews and Infidels, as these Commissions require, but are altogether unable for such a work. For, let me ask you, Can you speak the tongues of all the people in the world? of *Indians, Ethiopians, Turks, Scythians, Jews*, &c. Or can you work miracles, which were so necessary for the laying of the foundation of Christianity amongst Infidels, which power Christ promised to his Apostles to whom he directly gave this Commission, and accordingly inabled them thereunto. If you cannot do these, boast no more of these Scriptures.

3. Yea though you would insinuate that these Scriptures are much against our judgement and practice; yet I hope it will appear anon that they are much for us. Only let me first prevent an objection, which is this; If these Scriptures make not for the Anabaptists, surely they cannot make for you: The forenamed reasons hold as strongly against your selves as them, for do you lay new foundations of Churches any more then they? can you speak with all tongues and work miracles? do you go amongst infidels to preach any more then they? *Ob.*

The difference of our judgement and practice from theirs, frees us from this objection which must necessarily press them. For 1. Whereas they talk of constituting new Churches, and so would lay a new foundation, as if they were to deal with Jews and other Infidels: We Ministers of Christ in this Nation, and our brethren the Pastors and Teachers of Christian Churches in all other Nations, build still on the old foundation, laid by the Apostles; and labour for the reformation, increase and propagation of those Churches which were constituted by them, or did flow from those first constituted Churches, as branches from a stock, so that we by virtue of these Commissions, preach the word and baptize in all Nations (where God is pleased to continue his truth) not each one severally in all Nations, but all of us distributively in several Churches, and collectively in the whole visible Church, each one looking to *Ans.*

his proper charge, and yielding mutual help upon occasion, by which means the whole is provided for, not inchoatively by way of founding or constituting, but successively by way of edifying and propagating. 2. Whereas we require of you to shew miracles, speak strange languages, because you profess on these Scripture grounds to constitute new Churches, and lay the foundation of Christian Religion; we have good reason for it, sith miracles and tongues were necessary for this work to the Apostles; and surely no lesse necessary for those that will undertake the same work now. But seeing we build on the foundation laid by the Apostles, labouring for the edification and propagation of the Churches constituted by them, or at least, which have by propagation flowed from those which they founded; and seeing those Churches (or that Church) which we labour to edifie, were first founded by them which had the gifts of languages and miracles, and we teach a people that already professe Christ, and are convinced of the truth of Christian Religion; miracles are not necessary to us, nor can be rationally required of us. The same I may say of strange tongues, of which the Apostle saith that they are a
1 Cor. 15. 22. sign, not to them that beleeve, but to them that beleeve not. We therefore that preach to Christians, Beleevers, and Church-members, need them not; but you who pretend to constitute Churches, look on those that are not dipped by you, as Heathens, Infidels, and without Christendom, should speak with tongues, that you may convince these Infidels of the truth of your doctrine. 3. You bring these Scriptures as directly, and without deduction or consequence belonging to you; we argue from them, so as to apply them to our selves, by deduction and consequence. By this it appears how justly we make use of these Scriptures, being Ministers of those Churches, which by a continued flux have been propagated from those founded by the Apostles, and so may humbly boast of, and lay claim unto those promises, *Mat.* 16. 18. *On this Rock will I build my*
Mat. 16. 18. *Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it* And *Mat.* 28. 20. *And lo I am*
Mat. 28. 20. *with you alway even to the end of the world*; which promises could not belong to the Apostles only (for they continued not unto the end of the world in the work of the Ministry,) but to them and the Churches and Ministers which should succeed them. For Christ promiseth to the Apostles that he will be with them in discipling, baptizing, teaching the things which he had commanded them, unto the worlds end, which work when the Apostles died, they delivered up to succeeding Ministers.

I come now to shew how these places make for us. 1. In *Mat* 28. 19. That
μαθητευσατε which you reade according to our Translation, *Teach*, is properly, Make disciples or scholers. Now not only aged persons which are come to discretion, may be made scholers or disciples of Christ, but also children. 1. As God hath
Isa. 54. 13. promised that in his Church where his Gospel and Covenant are dispensed, he
Jer. 31. 34. will teach his people from the least to the greatest, all the Churches children
Deut. 30. 6. shall be taught of God. Gods Spirit shall not depart from their seed, nor seeds seed, &c. 2. As they are with and by their parents devoted to God, to be brought up in his School, by outward instruction, when capable, and we know that little children, which yet cannot learn, being sent to school are called scholDeut. 6. 7. &
Eph. 6. 4. ers, because they are in the school and intended for learning, when capacity
2 Tim. 3. 15. shall be given. Thus children of Beleevers are from their infancy devoted to Christs School, to be brought in the nurture and information of the Lord,

and

and we know no age is uncapable of Gods teaching. 3. It is said, *Act.* 15. *v.* 1. compared with 10. that the false Apostles which urged Christians to be circumcised according to the law of *Moses* (which we know was, that children should be circumcised at eight daies old) did put a yoke on the neck of the disciples, so that they are called disciples on whom they urged Circumcision, but they urged Circumcision not only on grown Christians, but also on their children, Therefore their children are disciples. 4. In *Act.* 21. 4, & 5. verses, Those of *Tyre* which are called disciples, *ver.* 4. (whereof some were endued with the spirit of Prophecie indeed (but all are not Prophets) and warned *Paul* of the danger of going to *Jerusalem,*) seem to be comprehended under these three heads, 1. Men, or the husbands and fathers. 2. Women, 3. Their children, who accompanied the Apostle to the sea-shore, and most likely the Infants in their mothers arms are here intended, who with their parents were taken along, when they went to take their last farwell of the Apostle, as well to expresse that dear affection and honour that they did owe to him, as to obtain, not only for themselves, but also for their little ones the benefit of the last prayer, wherein they were to join in presence with that faithfull Embassadour of Christ: The presence of children and sucklings tending much to move the bowels of parents to crave, and the Apostle to make affectionate prayers for those Saints and their children whom he should never see more. As *Moses* before his last farwell to the *Israelites,* would have them stand before God with their little ones, and enter into Covenant with him: So these at their farwell-taking with the Apostle, did present themselves before God with their little ones: And as *Ezra* in that solemn humiliation sought of God a good way, not only for the aged, but also for the little ones. So it seems these pious parents would have *Paul* to seek unto God for themselves and their little ones; they no lesse belonging to God and being disciples now, then in the time of *Moses* his law, and therefore they enjoy the priviledge of disciples or persons in Covenant, *viz.* communion with the Apostle and the other Saints in solemn prayer, which undiscipled persons and aliens from the Covenant, were never admitted to. *Ob.* But the fathers are evidently distinguished by the names of disciples from their children, therefore the children were not disciples, seeing the name of disciples is appropriated to the men only. *Ans.* If this reason were good, the wives should be no disciples or beleevers, for they are no lesse distinguished from the men (to whom the name of disciples is appropriated then the children) but no man will deny the wives to be disciples or beleevers, for this distinction, thetefore neither the children. 2. But the children and wives did equally partake in the priviledge of disciples, *viz.* communion in the prayer with the Apostles and Saints as well as the men, Therefore they were disciples as well as the men. 5. They that are so to be received in Christs Name, that Christ himself is received in them, belong to Christ and are Christs disciples. For to shew kindnesse or do service to any in Christs Name, and because they belong to Christ, and because they are disciples, or in the name of disciples, or because they are such as beleeve in Christ, are all one in Scripture phrase, as may appear by comparing these Scriptures, *Mat.* 10. 42. *Mar.* 9. 41, 42. But the little children of Beleevers or Church-members are so to be received in Christs Name, that Christ himself is received in or with them, *Mat.* 18. 5. Therefore they are Christs Disciples and belong to him. So much concern-

1 Cor. 12, 29.

Deut. 29 10, 11, 12.

Ezr. 8. 21.

Ob.

Ans.

Mat. 18, 5.

ing

ing the word μαθητευσατε, and hence I argue thus.

1. Diſciples according to Chriſts Commiſſion laid down in Scripture, are to be baptized: But children of the faithfull, even whilſt Infants, are diſciples, Therefore to be baptized.

2. Whereas it is ſaid, Make diſciples all Nations, baptizing them; hence I gather, Children are not to be excluded: 1. Becauſe children are a very conſiderable and eſſential part of a Nation. 2. As the Jewiſh Nation had been a Nation of diſciples, and an holy people; ſo now in the time of the Goſpel the Chriſtian Nations were to become Gods people. But the Jews were ſo a Nation of diſciples, and an holy people, as that their children were taken with them into the Covenant, and admitted to the ſeal of entrance: ſo ſhould theſe; for Chriſtians are called an holy Nation now, as the Jews heretofore. Hence I argue, Diſcipled Nations, or Nations made diſciples, and all their members and conſiderable integral parts, no where excepted, are to be baptized. For the whole comprehends all the parts, and the command that appoints all Nations to be baptized, muſt needs take in the ſeveral parts of thoſe Nations which are no where excepted: But children of beleeving Nations are members and conſiderable integral parts of diſcipled Nations, as being more in number for the moſt part then grown perſons, the hope of poſterity, in whom the parents live, and by whom States, Churches and families are continued; being alſo more free from ſin (as uncapable of actual rebellion and provocation againſt God, whom he is pleaſed ſometimes to ſpare, when he puniſheth rebellious and Covenant-breaking parents, and for whoſe ſake ſometimes he ſpareth flagitious parents) neither are children in this Scripture or elſwhere excluded out of Chriſts Commiſſion; Therefore they are to be baptized.

1 Pet. 2. 9.

Num. 14. 30, 31.

Ion. 4. 11.

3. From the order of Chriſts Commiſſion, it may be gathered, That diſcipling and baptizing goeth before teaching. *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. Thus we reade, *Going therefore, make diſciples all Nations, Baptizing them into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Ghoſt, teaching them to keep all things whatſoever I have commanded you.* Indeed the Goſpel was to be offered to Jews and Infidels, and they exhorted to accept Chriſt and the Covenant of grace, before they were baptized; but Baptiſm was not to be deferred, nor they rejected as no diſciples, untill they ſhould have learned the whole Doctrine of Chriſtianity, and all the commands of Chriſt. But whoſoever on the preaching of the Goſpel and offer of Chriſt, ſhould not ſtubbornly refuſe him, but (Idolatry being renounced) were dedicated to the worſhip of God and Chriſt (whether ſuch as had power to diſpoſe of themſelves by themſelves profeſſedly conſenting; or ſuch as were at the diſpoſe and under the power of others, and by their conſent and authority given up to Chriſt) they were to be admitted into Chriſts ſchool, acknowledged his diſciples, and baptized into his Name, and afterward to be inſtructed in his doctrine and commands. Hence I gather thus. If Infants of Beleevers are not to be baptized, it is becauſe they are not capable of being taught Miniſterially in the doctrines and commands of Chriſt for the preſent. All the arguments of the Anabaptiſts may be referred to this head, They ſay they cannot repent, beleeve, enter into Covenant, *&c.* Why? becauſe ſay they, they are uncapable of being taught; or at leaſt they would gather from Chriſts Commiſſion they are uncapable of being preached to and taught; Therefore of being baptized.

But

But this is not a ſufficient cauſe why they ſhould not be baptized: For teaching the doctrines and commands of Chriſt, ſhould go after, not before Baptiſm, according to the order of Chriſts Commiſſion; It's enough that perſons be devoted to Chriſt, upon the tender of the Goſpel, by thoſe that have power externally to dedicate them to him, and then they are to be baptized, and as it were, matriculated into his School, and after taught all things that Chriſt hath commanded them; the contrary courſe is a prepoſterous inverting of the order of Chriſt; Therefore Baptiſm is not to be denied to the Infants of Beleevers. But they are by their parents to be dedicated to Chriſt and then baptized, and afterwards inſtructed and taught in all the doctrines and commands of Chriſt, which way is moſt agreeable to the order of Chriſts Commiſſion.

4. Whereas it is ſaid in *Mark* 16.16. *He that beleeveth and is baptized ſhall be ſaved, he that beleeveth not ſhall be condemned.* If you will take theſe words preciſely, as containing a generall and compleat rule, by which we muſt judge who muſt be baptized and ſaved, who not, without limitation to the firſt calling of Jews and Gentiles to Chriſtianity. I reaſon thus againſt you from this Scripture, Children, even the Infants of Chriſtians, either beleeve or not. If they beleeve, having faith though but ſeminal or virtual comprehended in regeneration or circumciſion of the heart, which God promiſeth to the ſeed of the faithfull, or may be ſaid to beleeve in their parents, who accept of the Covenant for themſelves and their ſeed, then they are to be baptized, as this Scripture ſhews, and your own argument againſt their Baptiſm yields; this being your great reaſon againſt baptizing children, becauſe, ſay you, they cannot beleeve. But if you ſay they do not, cannot beleeve, they are all damned by you, from this Scripture, which ſaith expreſſely, *Whoſoever beleeves not ſhall be condemned.* Take which you will, If you ſay the former the cauſe is yielded by you. If the later, *viz.* That all the children of Beleevers, whiles Infants, are condemned, and that there is no hope of ſalvation if they die before grown years, this being ſo contrary to the Covenant of God, and his promiſes, will make you deſervedly abhorred, of all thoſe that know God, his Covenant and Scriptures. If you to avoid this *dilemma* ſay, this Scripture belongs only to thoſe of grown years, as were thoſe unbeleeving Jews and Heathens, to whom the Apoſtles were immediatly ſent: and therefore the condemnation of Infants, through want of actual faith cannot be hence concluded; you anſwer your ſelves, and might as eaſily ſee, that the excluſion of Infants from Baptiſm, for want of actuall, perſonal profeſſed faith, cannot hence be gathered, eſpecially ſeeing theſe words are far more peremptory and expreſſe againſt the ſalvation, then againſt the Baptiſm of non-beleevers. Deut. 30.6.

Secondly, You ſay, *What you practiſe is proved to be the Baptiſm of Chriſt, by the practice of the Diſciples in obedience to thoſe commands, as* Act. 2.38. *Then Peter ſaid unto them, Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt unto the remiſſion of ſins,* ver. 41. *Then they that gladly received the word, were baptized, and the ſame day added to the Church.*

Anſ. You cut off in the citation of this Scripture a very material part, namely, the ground of the Apoſtles exhortation to them to be baptized, which if you would have conſidered ſeriouſly, might have made you afraid to urge this place for your purpoſe. It ſeems you thought it good policy to omit it, leaſt others ſhould ſee how little it makes for your purpoſe, or rather how much againſt

gainſt you. The words you omitted are in *ver.*39. The Apoſtle having exhorted them to repent and be baptized in the Name of Chriſt, for the remiſſion of ſin, and that they might receive the gift of the holy Ghoſt: adds this reaſon, *ver.*39. *For the promiſe is to you and to your children, and to all that be afar off, ſo many as the Lord our God ſhall call.* Uſing this argument to perſwade them to be baptized, and to expect the ſpiritual bleſſing ſignified in Baptiſm, *viz.* the remiſſion of ſins and pouring of the Spirit on them; for the promiſe (ſaith he) is to you and your children: and leaſt we ſhould think that this priviledge was peculiar to the Jews, to have their children intereſted in the promiſe with their parents; he adds, *And to all that be afar off, ſo many as the Lord your God ſhall call.* Noting that all that ſhall be called of the remote Gentiles, ſhall enjoy the like priviledge, namely that the promiſe ſhall belong, not only to them, but alſo their children. Whence I reaſon thus, To whom the promiſe of remiſſion of ſins, and the gift of the holy Ghoſt belongs, to the ſame alſo Baptiſm, the pledge thereof, belongs; for this is the ſumme of the Apoſtles reaſoning, to be gathered out of the 38. and 39. *verſe.* But the promiſe is to the faithfull or people of God and their children, whether Jews or Gentiles, even thoſe that were afar off, whom God ſhall call; and therefore Baptiſm belongs to them and their children. You know who forbids to add to or take from the word, and who is the ringleader of that art of curtayling the word.

Deut.4.2. Mat.4.6. compared with Pſal.91. 11,12.

2. Whereas it is ſaid, Thoſe that gladly received the word, were baptized; It may be well underſtood, as they received the word they received Baptiſm the ſeal and appendix of the word. But they received the word of promiſe as it was propounded to them by the Apoſtles, which was thus, That it belonged to them and their children, Therefore anſwerably the ſeal of the word, *viz.* Baptiſm, belonging to them and their children, they were baptized and their children.

3. Whereas you ſay, *They that received the word were added to the Church:* The text ſaith, *And the ſame day there were added to the Church three thouſand ſouls.* It is not ſafe thus to make bold with, and miſ-report Scripture.

The next Scripture which you cite is, "*Act.*8.1. *But when they beleeved, Phi-* "*lip preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God, in the Name of Jeſus, they* "*were baptized, both men and women.* To this I anſwer.

1. Who knows not that the words, men and women, are names rather noting the ſexes then ages, and are appliable to Infants as well as grown perſons? Did not *Eve* when ſhe had born her firſt childe ſay, *I have gotten a man from the Lord?* Will you hence gather, that becauſe ſhe cals him a man, therefore he was at perfect age at the day of his birth? When Chriſt ſaith that the woman when ſhe is delivered of a childe, remembred not her anguiſh for joy that a man is born into the world; doth it follow hence that the new-born childe is a full-grown man? No ſure, the word notes the ſpecies or kinde of man diſtinct from other creatures, without difference of age or ſex: So then you cannot from the names of men and women conclude the ripeneſſe and perfection of years.

Gen.4. קניתי איש

Ioh.16.21.

ἀνθρωπος.

2. If you object, But they beleeved: Remember what is ſaid on *Mar.*16. 15,16. and *Act.*2.39. and you may gather thence, That when parents become Beleevers, God accepts their Infant children as Beleevers, and giveth them right to the Covenant and promiſe.

3 But

3. But howſoever, enough hath been ſaid in the general conſiderations to ſhew how little help you can have from this or any other Scripture for your purpoſe.

The following proof is in "*Act.8.36.37. The Eunuch ſaith, Loe, here is wa-*
"*ter, what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip ſaid, If thou beleeveſt with all*
"*thy heart thou maiſt.*

Anſ. We grant that they which never lived in a Chriſtian Church, nor were born of Chriſtian parents, nor have intereſt in the Covenant by their parents faith (which was the caſe of the Eunuch) are to be baptized when they beleeve and not before: But what makes this for your purpoſe? 2. But what would you gather hence? that none are to be baptized, but they which beleeve with their whole heart? If ſo, I anſwer, 1. Then you will condemn not only us, but alſo the ſame *Philip* for baptizing *Simon* whoſe heart was not right in the ſight of God, and therefore he beleeved not with his whole heart: you muſt condemn many of your own dippings, for doubtleſſe many come to you to be dipped for baſe ends. You cannot promiſe to your ſelves more dexterity then was in the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts to baptize none but upright-hearted ones. 3. If ſo, you muſt not baptize any untill you ſee into their hearts, that they beleeve ſincerely, and then you muſt lay down your new trade of dipping; for none but God ſeeth mens hearts whether they be upright or nō. Act.8,12,13. 21. 1 King 8. 9.

Your next Scripture is, "*Act.10.47. Then anſwered Peter, Can any forbid*
"*water that theſe ſhould not be baptized, which have received the holy Ghoſt as we?*
"*and he commanded them to be baptized in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt.*

Anſ. 1. It is plain that the Apoſtle gives this as a reaſon why they ſhould be baptized, becauſe they had received the gift of the holy Ghoſt. Now you can hence gather immediatly no warrant for your baptizing, untill you can procure by your preaching the effuſion of the holy Ghoſt, in a viſible and miraculous manner; as it is evident that that in the text was. Act.10.44,45. and 11,15.

2. But if you ſay, Indeed theſe viſible and miraculous gifts of the holy Ghoſt ceaſe with the Primitive times: But God now pours his Spirit of ſanctification ordinarily, and inviſibly on people, and ſuch as have received that may be baptized. I grant it, and aſſume, The gift of the holy Ghoſt is promiſed to, and beſtowed on Infants in the Church, not only extraordinarily, as in the example of *John* the Baptiſt, but ordinarily according to Gods promiſe, *Act.2.38,39. Iſa.44.3,4,5.*

Your following example is, *Act.16.32,33,34. And they ſpake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his houſe. And he took them the ſame hour of the night, and waſhed their ſtripes, and was baptized he and all his ſtraitway. And when he had brought them into his houſe, he ſet meat before them, and rejoiced that he and all his beleeved in God.*

Anſ. To this I anſwer, The laſt words are miſ-cited (*And rejoiced that he and all his beleeved in God.*) Our Tranſlators render it, *And rejoiced* (*beleeving in God with all his houſe.*) Which if the Parentheſis had been obſerved, and in ſtead of (*beleeving*) they had read (*having beleeved*, or *after he had beleeved*) had very fully and fitly ſet forth the emphaſis of the Original; which is thus word for word, ἠγαλλιάσατο *He exceedingly rejoiced* (or *exulted*) *with* (*in* or *through*) *his whole houſe, after that he had beleeved in God*, or *he having beleeved in God, rejoiced in his whole houſe.* Here it is not ſaid that the whole houſe beleeved in God; but the words ſhew that the πανοικὶ πεπιστευκὼς τῷ Θεῷ.

Jaylor when he had beleeved in God, and he and all his were baptized, he made a feaſt, and ſhewed his exceeding joy through his whole houſe, or with his whole houſe. The *Syriack* Tranſlation reades it thus, *And he exulted and all the children of his houſe, even all of them in the faith of God.* Now conſider in this Hiſtory theſe things. 1. How that when the poor affrighted Jaylour ſaith, *What ſhall I do that I may be ſaved? Paul* and *Silas* anſwer, *Beleeve in the Lord Jeſus, and thou ſhalt be ſaved and all thine houſe.* They require faith of the Jaylour, that he and his family might be admitted into a ſaving eſtate. They ſaid not that every one of his family muſt of neceſſity actually beleeve and profeſſe, that ſo his houſhold might be ſaved with him; but they tell him If he beleeve, both he and his houſhold ſhould be ſaved: As *Abraham* beleeved, and all his family, even Infants, were taken into Covenant of ſalvation. And when *Zacheus* beleeved, ſalvation came to his houſe, he being made a ſon of *Abraham.* So God ſhews here by his ſervants that he would deal with the Jaylour, not ſtanding for the preſent on ſtrict terms of actual faith of all in his houſe. If the Governour beleeve, it is enough to put the whole family into a ſaving eſtate, inchoatively at leaſt in reſpect of admiſſion into Covenant, neither are any to be excluded, but ſuch as by ſtubborn refuſal of the Goſpel offered, deprive themſelves of that priviledge.

וירן הוא ובני ביתה כלהין בהימנותא דאלהא

Gen. 17. 7. Luk. 19. 9.

2. It is ſaid indeed, that they ſpake to him and all in his houſe, *verſ.* 32. the word of the Lord; but whether it be meant of the priſoners in the Priſon-houſe, with *Paul* and *Silas*, or of thoſe of his houſhold, is not expreſſed; the former ſeems very probable rather then the later. 1. Thoſe to whom they ſpake the word are ſaid to be *All that were in his houſe*, v. 32. Thoſe that were baptized with him are ſaid to be *all his*: Now priſoners and ſtrangers might be in his houſe, but thoſe only of his own family were his. 2. *Ver.* 32. It is ſaid they ſpake to all in the houſe, and yet afterwards it is ſaid, *ver.* 34. that he brought them into his houſe; as if they had not been in his dwelling houſe before.

3. If it be meant of his family to which they ſpake the word, that proves not that there were no Infants in the family, or that the Infants were not taken into Covenant, and baptized with their parents, any more then the exhortation of *Moſes* to that great aſſembly of the *Iſraelites*, mentioned, *Deut.* 29. 9, 10, 11, 12. proves either that there were no little children in that aſſembly, or that they had no right to the Covenant; both which are expreſly contradicted in the context, *verſ.* 9. *Keep therefore*, ſaith *Moſes*, *the words of this Covenant and do them, that ye may proſper in all that ye do.* Verſ. 10. *Ye ſtand this day all of you before the Lord your God, your Captains of your Tribes, your Elders, and your Officers, with all the men of Iſrael.* Verſ. 11. *Your little ones, your wives, and thy ſtranger that is in the Camp; from the hewer of thy wood to the drawer of thy water.* Verſ. 12. *That thou ſhouldeſt enter into Covenant with the Lord thy God, and into his Oath which the Lord thy God maketh with thee this day*, &c. Now as *Moſes* made this exhortation to all *Iſrael*, though the little children amongſt them were not able to underſtand it, and be affected with it for the preſent, and yet were preſent to be admitted into Covenant, and had right to the ſeal of entrance thereinto: and this exhortation was for their good, as their parents embracing it, were with their children received into Covenant, and put in minde of their duty, in devoting their children to, and bringing them up for God; and as it might ſerve for the childrens inſtruction when they ſhould come to age. So

Paul.

Paul and *Silas* might ſpeak to the whole family, amongſt whom might be little ones; who though they underſtood not the doctrine and exhortation propounded for the preſent, yet might upon the parents imbracing of this doctrine, be received into Covenant with them, and to the ſeal of entrance thereinto; and afterward by their parents inſtructed in that doctrine, which for the preſent they underſtood not.

4. It is ſaid that he and all his were baptized ſtraitway. There is no expreſſion or intimation that every one beleeved and made a profeſſion of his faith for themſelves ſeverally: but when the Jaylour had manifeſted his repentance and faith, he and all his were baptized ſtraitway. It ſeems that the faith and profeſſion of the head of the family, was ſufficient to give right to the members, at leaſt to thoſe that did not expreſs their diſſent or refuſal of it. καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη καὶ οἱ αὐτοῦ πάντες παραχρῆμα.

5. The word *(having beleeved)* verſ. 34. is of the ſingular number and maſculine gender, and muſt be referred to the Jaylour only, according to the Grammatical conſtruction.

6. Though it ſhould be granted that he and his whole houſe may be ſaid to beleeve (which yet the words of the text prove not) It may be well underſtood ſo as *Abraham* and all his family were beleevers in Covenant, and circumciſed, even thoſe that were Infants: the Head having made profeſſion of his faith and ingaged himſelf to take care of all his family ſhould be inſtructed in the faith and obedience of God. And this laſt anſwer (beſide divers of the former general and ſpecial) may ſerve for the laſt Scripture, *viz.* "*Act.* 18.8. "*And Criſpus the chief Ruler of the Synagogue beleeved in the Lord with all his* "*houſe; and many of the Corinthians beleeved and were baptized.* And indeed how can it be thought probable that ſuch families as the Jaylours, the Rulers of the Synagogue, and *Lydias* (whoſe houſhold was baptized upon her hearing and beleeving of the word, no mention being made of the reſts hearing or beleeving) ſhould have no children in them? Hence I gather thus, Gen. 18. 19.

If at the firſt preaching of the Goſpel the faithfull with their whole families were baptized, ſo ſoon as God had opened the hearts of the governours to receive the word and beleeve, then now the families and children of thoſe that have long profeſſed the Goſpel (at leaſt ſo many in their family as do not ſtubbornly reject Jeſus Chriſt) are to be acknowledged within the Covenant, and admitted to Baptiſm the ſeal of entrance. But the former is true, Therefore the later.

Whereas you conclude your firſt Paper thus: *Having proved by poſitive and plain Scripture what we affirm, we conclude with the doctrine of the Church of* England *which maintains the ſame,* viz. *That repentance and faith is required in perſons to be baptized, and that Infants by reaſon of tender age can neither repent nor beleeve, which we leave to your conſideration, and deſire your anſwer.*

Anſ. How poſitive and plain the Scriptures (cited by you to prove what you affirm and practiſe) are, we have ſeen, and leave to the judgement of others.

2. In your concluding with the doctrine of the Church of *England*, you might have done well to have told us what you mean by the Church, and in what book or place that doctrine is maintained, and then we ſhould have given anſwer thereto, if the very citation of the place be not ſufficient to anſwer it, and make you aſhamed of your citing of it. But in the mean ſpace you have our conſideration and anſwer to what you bring out of Scripture.

By me *William Cooke.*

You Preface to your ſecond Paper thus:

H.H. and J.B. *INſtead of an expected anſwer in writing, to this our Paper, according to promiſe, we have received another verbal requeſt from you,* viz. *That we would give ſome reaſons, why Infants ſhould not be baptized: By which we conclude you can give no reaſon, why you baptize them; we having ſo much urged you herein, to prove your practice by Scripture, having given you ſo large a proof of our practiſing the contrary, by ſo many plain truths, wherein you may finde reaſon enough againſt yours, if you have any minde, without further cavil to anſwer them.*

Anſwer.

1. IT was agreeable to reaſon and equity; that ſeeing you had ſo fully and frequently expreſſed your ſelves againſt Infant-Baptiſm, you ſhould give your reaſons thereof, eſpecially we having been ſo long in poſſeſſion: and being by you charged to want right, it was fit that you ſhould be required to produce the grounds of your charge.

2. Whereas you conclude ſo haſtily, that we can give no reaſon of our practice; we ſee that though you diſlike ſyllogiſms, you are pleaſed with ſophiſticall Enthymems, making a concluſion from ſo weak a premiſe.

3. How much the many plain written truths prove for your own judgement and practice, or againſt ours, we wiſh you to review in the foregoing Anſwer, and you will there finde that without cavils we had a minde to anſwer. You proceed,

But that you may ſee how really we intend the diſcovery of truth, and to ſatisfie you in every deſire that may any way tend thereto, we give you theſe further in anſwer.
1. *Becauſe Chriſt hath no where commanded it. And whatſoever is practiſed as an ordinance of his without inſtitution, is Will-worſhip and Idolatry.*

Anſ. This your reaſon in its full ſtrength ſtands thus:

Whatſoever is practiſed as an Ordinance of Chriſt without an inſtitution, is Will-worſhip and Idolatry; But baptizing of Infants is practiſed as an Ordinance of Chriſt without any inſtitution, Therefore it is Will-worſhip and Idolatry. The aſſumption which would by us be denied, you back thus; It hath no command from Chriſt, Therefore it is without an inſtitution.

Anſ. In anſwer to this I deſire you to take notice of two diſtinctions, neceſſary to remove miſtakes. 1. We muſt diſtinguiſh between the eſſentials of an Ordinance, and the accidentals and circumſtantials, in reſpect of the application of it to ſuch or ſuch perſons in ſuch a time, place, or manner: This is neceſſary to be obſerved. Chriſt inſtituted the Ordinance of the Supper or Communion of the body and bloud of Chriſt; but never expreſly commanded that it ſhould be adminiſtred to women. It's ſufficient that it may be gathered from Scripture. He hath inſtituted Baptiſm, but never expreſly commanded that it ſhould be adminiſtred to or by Taylours, Weavers, Jerſey-combers or Coblers; If from general rules of Scripture it can be proved that this Ordinance is to be applied to or by ſuch perſons, they being found to have ſuch qualifi-

cations,

cations, as the Scripture requires in theſe caſes, it is ſufficient. It is an Ordinance of Chriſt that his people ſhould reade the Scripture, but it's no where expreſly commanded that ſuch as underſtand not the original, ſhould reade it in a tranſlated printed *Engliſh* Bible; it ſufficeth, that this may be proved out of Scripture by good conſequence.

The ſecond diſtinction is this, An Ordinance in reſpect of circumſtantials or applications, may be ſaid to be inſtituted by Chriſt, either expreſly and immediatly, or ſo as that the inſtitution is to be gathered by conſequence; of this later kinde is a beleeving womans receiving the Sacrament of the Communion of the body and bloud of Chriſt, and meer Engliſh-mens and Engliſh-womens reading the Scripture for ſpiritual inſtruction and edification, in a printed *Engliſh* Bible, diſtinguiſhed into Chapters and Verſes. There is no expreſſe command for admitting women to the Lords Table; nor for the tranſlating and printing of Scripture, for the help of ignorant people, yet theſe are not Will-worſhip and Idolatry. It may be ſufficiently proved from Scripture that theſe are good and warrantable, and that Gods people ſhould be greatly wronged, if women ſhould be driven from the Communion; and thoſe that are ignorant of Hebrew and Greek ſhould be debarred from reading the Scripture.

I anſwer therefore, 1. By granting the propoſition taken in a right ſenſe, *viz.* That whatſoever is practiſed as an Ordinance and worſhip of Chriſt, without an inſtitution from him; at leaſt in reſpect of the eſſentials, yea whoſe eſſentials and circumſtantials may not be gathered out of the Scripture, either expreſly or by good conſequence, is at leaſt Will-worſhip, if not Idolatry; and therefore unlawfull to be maintained or practiſed. But I deny the aſſumption; for the eſſentials and ſubſtantials of Baptiſm are expreſly commanded in Scripture, *Mat.*28.19,20. *Mar.*16.15,16,&c. The particular application of Baptiſm to Infants, though not expreſly in ſo many words in Scripture, yet may be gathered therefrom by good conſequence, as ſhall appear hereafter, God aſſiſting. Therefore the aſſumption being falſe in that ſenſe wherein the propoſition is true, nothing can be concluded.

I come now to your ſecond argument which is this.

It cannot be proved that Chriſt or his Apoſtles practiſed Infant-Baptiſm. Which reaſon ſtands in its whole ſtrength thus,

What cannot be proved that Chriſt and his Apoſtles practiſed, that is unlawfull in Gods worſhip. But it cannot be proved that Chriſt and his Apoſtles practiſed Infant-baptiſm, Therefore it is unlawfull.

Anſ. The propoſition is not univerſally true, we may not argue from the practice of Chriſt and his Apoſtles univerſally, either affirmatively or negatively; not affirmatively, for they might do ſome things as ſuch eminent perſons, which it is not the duty of, nor poſſible for all Miniſters or Chriſtians ordinarily to do ſo. Nor negatively, for there may be ſome things which are the duties of inferiour men, which yet were below Chriſt and his Apoſtles. We reade not that they practiſed or ſubmitted to the Office of Paſtors, Elders, or Deacons, properly ſo called; will it follow therefore that theſe are Will-worſhip? They never (as can be proved) tranſlated Bibles or read the Scripture, or propounded the text of a Sermon out of a tranſlated printed Bible; nor took the notes of Sermons: Are theſe therefore Will-worſhip? If they

being busied in laying the foundation of Churches, practised not some things which are agreeable to our work, which is for the superstruction; we need not to be troubled, having warrant or institution, either immediate, or to be gathered by consequence.

Neither is the assumption so clear as to be easily granted, and though it might suffice for the present to deny the main proposition; yet take also this answer to the assumption; Though Christ did not baptize Infants nor any at all in his own person (and therefore if his example is to be followed herein by Ministers, or those that may be conceived to have authority to baptize, none at all must be baptized by them,) Yet he did that for Infants, which is at least equivalent to baptizing, or layeth sufficient ground to warrant their baptizing, he laid his hands on them, blesseth them, pronounceth them to have right to the Kingdom of God or Covenant of the Gospel; and gives command to his Apostles to disciple all Nations, and baptize them. The Apostles acted according to this Commission, held forth the promise, whereof Baptism is a seal or pledge, as belonging to the faithfull and their children, and baptized Beleevers and their whole families; of which more largely, partly before, partly hereafter.

Iob.4.2.

Your third Argument is this, " *Because they are uncapable subjects, having neither understanding, reason, nor faith; and whatever is not of faith is sin.* Being put into form it stands thus;

Subjects uncapable of Baptism are not to be baptized: But Infants are subjects uncapable of Baptism, Therefore not to be baptized. The proposition is granted, the assumption denied, you endeavour to prove it thus;

They that have neither understanding, reason nor faith are subjects uncapable of Baptism; But Infants have neither understanding, reason, nor faith: Therefore subjects uncapable of Baptism.

1. I answer to the proposition by denying it, if by understanding, reason, and faith, you mean ripe, actual and visibly exercised and professed understanding reason and faith, such as is in persons of ripe years: and I give these two reasons of my denial.

1.

1. The children of the Jews when they wanted the actual use of understanding which belongs to persons of age, were not uncapable of Circumcision which was of the same use to Jews; as Baptism is to us Christians, *viz.* to be a seal of the Covenant, and of the righteousnesse of faith, and a sign of renewing and sanctifying the heart.

Gen.17.7. Rom.4.11. Deut.30.6.

2. That they are capable, I prove it by the parts. Reason and even sense and experience shews that they are capable of the outward sign, there being required a meer passion of them, in the Ministers application of water. That they are capable also of the spiritual grace of Baptism, Gods many promises of circumcising the hearts of the faithfull seed, and pouring his Spirit upon them, *&c.* prove; as also the example of *Jacob* and *John* the Baptist, whereof the one was beloved of God, the other filled with the holy Ghost, while little ones.

2. 2. I answer to the assumption by distinction of the { first & second } act of { reason faith }. The power or faculty of understanding or reason which we may call the first act, Infants have, else they were bruits and unreasonable creatures, though the actual

actual exercise thereof which is in man they want; so a seminal virtual habitual faith implied in regeneration and the gift of the holy Ghost, they have, not a professed faith of ripe Beleevers.

2. If men will needs have actual professed faith for the admission of persons to Baptism, I answer, As parents by faith accept the Covenant for themselves and children, according as Scripture propounds the Covenant, *Gen.* 17.7. *Act.* 2.39. (which is agreeable to the usual way of contracts and Covenants amongst men, that parents take a Lease for themselves and infant-children, and binde themselves and children to the condition) as infant-children are parts and adherents of their parents, having no use of power, reason or will, to provide for, or dispose of themselves in their own persons, untill they come to years of discretion; so the faith of their parents may be said to be their faith, as the parents act in taking a house, or making a bargain, may be called the childes act, as no lesse beneficiall and obliging to the childe then to the parent; at least untill he come to the use of reason, where in his own person he may by some voluntary act ratifie or disannul it. And here observe a second distinction of faith, namely actual and professed. It is this professed faith may be distinguished into Personal and private, which is required of all persons which are at their own dispose, at their first entrance into Covenant and admission to the seal of entrance: and Common or publick faith, which in a common or publick person may suffice in the behalf of those that are wholly under his power and at his dispose, as Infants are to their parents. This is sufficient for such to interest them in the Covenant and seal of admittance, as we see in *Abrahams* and the Jewish Infants; and Christians children which are holy by virtue of their parents faith, 1 *Cor.* 7.14. and in this respect they may be said to have actual professed faith, *viz.* of their parents. If the Jews with their children were broken off by unbelief, as the Apostle affirmeth, *Rom* 11.29. then by faith they and their posterity had continued implanted, untill their posterity should by actual professed unbelief break off themselves and their posterity: The same is the case of the ingraffed Gentiles, and will be of the Jews that are to be reingraffed, *vers.* 20.23,24,25. that by virtue of the faith of the parents, infant-children should be in Covenant and beleevers (even professedly, by the profession of parents,) as it had been with Gods people for many generations before Christ; for the Apostle speaks of such a growing up in the Olive tree that the implanted Gentiles and reimplanted Jews must expect, as was that which the Church of the Jews had enjoyed to that time. And sure if the unbelief of professed Infidels, leave their infant-children, in the case of professed infidelity and estrangement from the Covenant, untill by their own personal individual faith, they embrace that Covenant; no lesse must the faith of beleeving parents leave their Infants in the state of professed or known Beleevers, and persons in Covenant, until by their own wilfull voluntary act they reject the Covenant; for Gods promises to the faithfull and their posterity, are no lesse full then his curses to the wicked and their posterity, *Exod.* 20.5,6. Gen. 17.7. Act. 2.39.

3. How ignorantly and impertinently that sentence is added by you (*Whatever is not of faith is sin*) any one may see. And thus for the answer to your Arguments. 3.

You prevent an Objection thus, *But you will say, Where doth the Scripture forbid? That, your Ministers will say, is an unreasonable and unlearned question, there be-* H.H. and J.B.

ing

ing no proving negatives; for then where doth the Scripture ſay, You ſhall not worſhip the Pope, go to Maſſe? you ſhall not reade the Common prayer book, or wear the Surpleſſe? But it doth forbid Idolatry, Will-worſhip, which is that, if you have no Scripture rule for the ſame, and teaching for doctrine the commands of men, which is this, being only traditionall, and that acknowledged by one of your Miniſters lately in this Town, that it was Eccleſiaſticall and not Apoſtolicall.

Deut.4,2. Prov.30,6. Iam 4. 11,12. Rev.22.8,9.

Anſ. The Scripture is ſuch a perfect rule to Gods people, of faith, worſhip and holy walking, both affirmatively and negatively, that nothing may be urged as a duty, Divine worſhip or truth, but what is there commanded or taught; nor charged as a ſin, Will-worſhip or errour, but what is there forbidden or condemned, either particularly and expreſly, or at leaſt in general, and to be gathered by good conſequence.

2. They are very ignorant and raſh, that will condemn worſhipping the Pope, going to Maſſe, &c. and yet cannot finde them forbidden in the Scripture; yea, they are too great friends to the Pope, Maſſe, and other ſuperſtition, that will ſay, or but inſinuare, that the Scripture doth no where condemn them, or that will match Infant-baptiſme with them.

3. Forbear charging us with Will-worſhip, Idolatry, and teaching for doctrines the commands of men, untill you have heard what Scripture grounds we can bring for our judgement and practice in this particular.

4. Why do not you name the Miniſter which acknowledged this traditional and Eccleſiaſtical, not Apoſtolical? If there were any ſuch let him anſwer for himſelf. The Papiſts indeed call it a tradition of the Church, to prove the imperfection of the Scripture, and neceſſity of tradition. Our Proteſtant Writers confute them in this, ſhewing that it is grounded on Scripture, not on tradition. If any whom you call one of our Miniſters, ſpeaks as the Papiſt, againſt the whole current of Proteſtant Divines, we are no more bound to ſtand to his principles, or to defend him therein, or anſwer for him, then we are bound to do it for you and the Papiſts which agree with him in that opinion.

Now before I lay down our Arguments, I muſt for the clearing of the truth, confirm one thing which I have partly touched already. It's this, That it is not only lawfull but neceſſary to argue from Scripture, by way of conſequence or deduction for the finding out of the truth; neither muſt we alwaies expect expreſſe and immediate commands in Scripture for the particular circumſtances and applications of the Ordinances of God, or for the juſtifying of every matter of judgement and practice, in point of Religion. It is ſufficient ſometimes, and in ſome caſes, that by good conſequence we deduce them from Scripture.

Mat 22,32,33 1 Cor.15.13, to 33. Mat.12.3,4, 5,6,7.

1. This was very uſuall with our Saviour and the Apoſtles. Thus our Saviour proves the doctrine of the Reſurrection againſt the Sadduces by conſequence, from that Scripture (*I am the God of Abraham, the God of Iſaac, and the God of Jacob*) laid together with another principle (*God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.*) Which doctrine alſo the Apoſtle *Paul* proves by many Arguments and conſequences, *1 Cor.*15. from *verſ.*13. to 33. So our Lord Chriſt argues (for the lawfulneſſe of his diſciples pulling ears of corn and eating them on the Sabbath day,) by conſequence. 1. From *Davids* eating of the Shew-bread. 2. From the Prieſts ſacrificing on the Sabbath: and 3. From

that

that ſentence in *Hoſea*, *I will have mercy, and not ſacrifice*. Which Scripture-examples and teſtimony do not expreſſely and immediatly ſay. It is lawfull for the diſciples, being hungry, to pluck ears of corn on the Sabbath day, and eat them. But by good conſequence each of theſe Scriptures, muth more all jointly prove it. So whereas it is ſaid, *Luke* 24.27. & 44. That Chriſt expounded the Scriptures of all the Prophets, ſhewing that they were fulfilled in him, It is not to be underſtood that thoſe things which were written of Chriſt in *Moſes*, the Prophets, and Pſalmes, did expreſſely, immediatly, plainly, and poſitively ſay that Jeſus the ſon of *Mary*, was the *Meſſias*, and muſt ſuffer all thoſe things, and then riſe again and enter into glory: But by Chriſts expounding them and arguing from them, the two diſciples were brought to ſee the truth. So *Act.*2.25,26,&c. the Apoſtle *Peter* ſheweth (to prove the reſurrection of Chriſt from Scripture) that what was contained in *Pſal.*16.9,10. was ſpoken of Chriſt. It doth not appear immediatly and expreſſely, but by conſequence thus; It was to be underſtood of *David* himſelf, or of Chriſt the ſeed of *David*. Not of *David*, for he had ſeen corruption, and his Sepulchre was yet extant, as *Act.*2.29. Therefore it muſt be meant of Chriſt *Davids* ſeed, *verſ.*30.31,32. So the other Apoſtles, in the Acts, and the Epiſtles, and the Prophets before them, uſually deduce concluſions, by way of reaſoning or ſyllogizing, either from Scriptures or other known principles, or both laid together, as is evident to any that with underſtanding and care reade the Scriptures; ſo that further to prove this, were to light a candle at noonday, and ſure he is miſerably blinde that cannot ſee it. Hos.6.6. Luk.24.27. & 44.

2. If you deny the uſe of conſequence, you have no warrant or proof for the reading of Scripture in an *Engliſh* tranſlation Printed (and ſo you muſt caſt away your *Engliſh* Bibles, as well as Infant-baptiſm, or elſe fall into Will-worſhip and Idolatry.) Nor for womens receiving the Communion, nor for the Chriſtian-Sabbath. Overthrow theſe, and overthrow all Chriſtian Religion. Yea I may confidently ſay there is no Ordinance of God or religious act can be externally obſerved, which you can perform, but at leaſt in reſpect of ſome accidentals or circumſtantials thereof you muſt be beholden to conſequence from Scripture, or elſe muſt want warrant for the uſing of them, and ſo either forbear them all, and caſt off all religious exerciſe, and become viſible Atheiſts, or run into that which is Will-worſhip and Idolatry in your conceit, and act againſt conſcience and not in faith, which to do is ſin.

3. Whereas all Scriptures were written for our learning, that we may have patience, comfort and hope, and are profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction and inſtruction: All or moſt of this benefit will be loſt unto us, if we reject the uſe of conſequences. The Scripture doth not poſitively and plainly make particular application to ſeveral men that live amongſt us by name: this muſt be done either by publike Miniſtry, or private brotherly inſtruction and conference, or by our own conſcience, which muſt by reaſoning ſhew that the Scripture applied is pertinent and ſutable to us, or elſe we ſhall get no good by it. Rom.15.4; 2 Tim.3.16,

4. For what uſe ſhould the Miniſtry of the word, or preaching and teaching by others ſerve, or what uſe is there of ſtudying and diligently ſearching the Scriptures, as for gold, ſilver, and hid treaſures, if all things therein were ſo plain and particular to us in them that there were no need of drawing particulars Pro.2.2,3,4.

ticulars from generals, gathering obſcurer truths from plainer Scriptures, and applying them according to exigency? Yea what uſe ſhould there be of reaſon it ſelf, if we might not exerciſe it in this caſe, which ſo much concerns Gods glory and our own and others edification and ſalvation? I ſtudy ſhortneſſe, elſe it might be eaſily made to appear, that they who deny and abhorre ſyllogiſms and conſequences in matters of Religion, do not only deny the principall uſe of the moſt excellent gift of reaſon which God hath given to men, for the finding out of the truth; but alſo muſt caſt off all right uſe of Conſcience, Scripture and Religion, if they ſtick to that irrationall and irreligious conceit. Taking it therefore for granted, that no man who hath the uſe of reaſon and the heart of a Chriſtian, will deny us the liberty of reaſon in drawing out the truth from Scriptures by conſequence: I will lay down ſeveral Arguments grounded on Scripture (whereof ſome were touched in the Anſwer to the former Paper: what I ſhall here omit which there I touched, the Reader may fetch thence,) for the baptizing of Infants.

Rom. 2. 15.
Rom. 12. 1.

Arg. 1. *Arg.* 1. Such perſons as have had by Gods gracious grant, right to the Covenant of grace and ſeal of entrance thereinto, in the time of the Old Teſtament, and from whom this grant was never repealed by God, nor caſt off by themſelves, are not to be debarred by any man from the priviledges of Gods Covenant, and the ſeal of entrance thereinto, whiles the Covenant of grace and a ſeal of entrance is diſpenſed to the Church.

But the children of beleeving parents, have, by Gods gracious grant, had intereſt in the Covenant of grace, and the ſeal of entrance thereinto, at leaſt from *Abrahams* time to Chriſts, which grant God did never repeal, neither did the children of Beleevers caſt it off, but God hath continued in his Church the Covenant of grace and ſeal of entrance thereinto, though in a different manner, yet far more comfortable and glorious,

Therefore the children of beleeving parents are not to be debarred from the Covenant or ſeal of entrance thereinto, which now in the time of the Goſpel is Baptiſm.

For the clearing of the Propoſition let theſe things be noted:

1. Gods gracious grants of priviledges to his people, wherein are alſo impliDeut. 4. 2. ed ingagements to thankfulneſſe and obedience laid on them, are ſo ſacred, that they cannot without high offence to his Majeſty, great wrong to Gods people, and extream danger to their own ſouls, be denied by any to thoſe to whom they belong. God no leſſe forbidding detracting from, then adding to his word; and ſo much the more dangerous is diminution in this caſe, as it tends to darken the glorious grace of God in the times of the Goſpel, which times he hath reſerved for the more full illuſtration thereof above former times.

2. That thoſe main priviledges which God granted ordinarily to perſons in Covenant before Chriſt, as That their children ſhould be in Covenant, and admitted to the ſeal of entrance thereinto, ſhould ceaſe in the time of the Goſpel, is ſo unagreeable unto the wiſdom and goodneſſe of God, which reſerves his greateſt and choiceſt bleſſings, for the laſt times, to be beſtowed on his people; ſo contrary to the nature of the Covenant of grace, which under Evangelical diſpenſation is far more glorious and comfortable to the faithfull, then under legall; ſo contrary to the end of Chriſts coming, which was to multiply, increaſe and ratifie, not cut off, diminiſh or aboliſh bleſſings and priviledges

ledges to his Church; and so contrary to the promises and prophecies concerning the glory of the Church in the times of the Gospel, that he deserves to be abhorred of all that know God, and Christ, and his Covenant, that should tell us of a great fall and diminution of priviledges, in Evangelicall times, compared with legall, and yet can bring no pregnant and pertinent Scripture, to prove a repeal of those priviledges.

3. I grant, that where God hath repealed priviledges of the Old Testament (which whiles they continued unrepealed, were priviledges, yet cease to be so when greater answerable thereto, yet more suitable to the Gospel-dispensation, are vouchsafed in their place in the New Testament,) they, in respect of that old administration, are not to be accounted priviledges, neither are priviledges in this case properly revoked, but altered and inlarged, when the old administration indeed is abrogated; but the same spiritual blessing is given in a more comfortable manner, under a new dispensation. As when Christians [1] In stead of the Old Testament Scriptures in the Jews mother tongue (which was the Jews priviledge) have both Old and New Testament Scriptures translated into a known tongue. [2] In stead of the Jews seventh-day-Sabbath, have the first day or Lords-day-Sabbath. [3] In stead of the Passeover, which to the Jews was a Type of Christ to come; have Christ exhibited, and now represented in the blessed Communion. And [4] in stead of Circumcision, have Baptism. And [5] generally, when Christians in stead of the old Legal dispensation of the Covenant of grace (which the Jews had) have the new Evangelical dispensation of the Covenant: Here the same priviledges are continued, with inlargement under a new and different garb or dresse. Ioh.19.36. 1 Cor.5.7.

4. It's granted also that when men have wilfully rejected priviledges, and therefore God hath cast them off; neither they nor theirs lying under that obstinacy, may lay claim to obstinatly rejected priviledges, as in the case of the body of the Jews and their seed at this day.

To the Minor, 1. It's plain that from *Abrahams* time and so forward to the last of the Prophets, yea to the time of our Saviour Christ (unto which time Circumcision of children was in force,) the faithfull had interest in this priviledge, that their children were in Covenant and had the seal of admission. Gen 17.7. Exod.12.48. Ezek.16.20. 21. Mat.2.15. Act.3.25.

2. It's plain also, that this was a great priviledge or prerogative to the people of God and their children, that they were in Covenant, and had Circumcision, which is called the sign of the Covenant; yea the Covenant and the seal of the righteousnesse of faith. As to be an *Hebrew* and *Israelite* was a great priviledge before Christs coming, so to be circumcised. Gen.17.10, 11,12,13. Rom.4.11. Rom 3.1,2. Phil.3.5.

3. That God hath not recalled this grant of Beleevers children having right to the Covenant and seal of entrance, it is evident; for neither the Scriptures of Old or New Testament speak any such thing, but rather the contrary, heightning the priviledges of the Gospel above those of the Law, but never depressing them.

Obj. But Circumcision is repealed and abrogated. *Ans.*1. True, in regard of the outward ceremony, so the former dispensation of the Covenant of grace, in regard of the Legal manner of administration; Doth the Covenant it self therefore, and duties and priviledges therefore which are essential and perpetual cease? Womens going up to Jerusalem to the sacrifices and Passeover ceaseth; Must not they therefore come to, and partake of the Lords Sup- *Ob.* *Ans.* 1.

per? The Church of the Jews, which underſtood the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament without tranſlation is caſt off, Muſt not Gods people now have the Scriptures in their mother language by tranſlation, becauſe there is no direct expreſſe Scripture for that purpoſe? The Jews Sabbath being the ſeventh day of the week, with us called Saturday, is aboliſhed; Muſt we not therefore have a Chriſtian Sabbath or Lords day? Nay rather, we may well gather from the Jewiſh-beleeving womens priviledge to partake of the Paſſeover and ſacrifices in the Old Teſtament, the priviledge of Chriſtian women, to come to the Lords Table, and from Jewiſh Beleevers liberty to have the Scriptures in a known tongue, we may gather againſt the Papiſts, the priviledge of Chriſtian common people, of the like nature, though in a different way; they by the Originall writing, we by Tranſlation: and from the Jews Sabbath of the ſeventh day, that being appointed by the moral Law, we may gather our Chriſtian Sabbath; and ſo from the Jewiſh infants priviledge to have the ſeal of initiation into the Covenant and Church, we may gather the like priviledge to belong to Chriſtians Infants, though in a different ceremony; if we compare thoſe priviledges of the Jews in the Old Teſtament, with what is ſpoken in the New Teſtament concerning Goſpel-priviledges, that are analogicall and ſuccedaneous to theſe legal priviledges, and lay together other common grounds warranting unto them theſe priviledges, though there be no expreſſe immediate particular command, for womens partaking at the Lords Table, nor for the common peoples enjoying vernaculous tranſlations of the Scripture, nor for the Chriſtian Sabbath, nor for the baptizing of Infants.

2. 2. I anſwer to this objection; If it had been the pleaſure of God and Chriſt that children ſhould in the time of the Goſpel loſe their former intereſt in the Covenant and ſeal thereof, and their priviledge of Church-membership, as well as he would have Circumciſion aboliſhed, he would have no leſſe revealed that in the Scripture then this. But he hath no where revealed either expreſſely or to be gathered by conſequence, that whereas untill Chriſts time Infants of Beleevers were in Covenant, Gods children, Church-members, and ſigned with the ſeal of the Covenant; now in the time of the Goſpel they have no intereſt in God, his Covenant, or the ſeal thereof, or Church-membership, but are quite caſt out from theſe priviledges.

4. Infants of beleeving parents never did caſt off this priviledge, ſo that by any act of theirs all Infants ſhould be deprived of it. For to caſt off Covenant-priviledges, imports actually to rebell againſt the Covenant, which children cannot do; neither can any child's (ſuppoſe him capable of actual rebellion and rejection of the Covenant,) or aged perſons actual rebellion, deprive all Infants of this priviledge, unleſſe he be the root, head and fountain of all Beleevers Infants, which is not ſuppoſable. Anabaptiſts may caſt themſelves and their children out of Covenant, but they cannot caſt out the children of other Chriſtian parents, otherwiſe then by ſeducing the parents into the ſame errour and impiety with themſelves or worſe; which oft fals out, that thoſe that compaſſe land and ſea to make proſelytes, help to make them twofold more the children of hell then themſelves. Mat. 23. 15.

5. Yea the Scriptures of the New Teſtament are ſo farre from repealing the priviledges of Beleevers Infants that they ſtrongly confirm and advance them,

as

as expreſſely telling us that to ſuch belongs the Kingdom of God: Goſpel-promiſes belong to them, they are holy, *Mark* 10.14. *Act.*2.39. 1 *Cor.*7.14, *&c.* of which hereafter.

6. That now the ſame Covenant of grace for ſubſtance remains amongſt Chriſtians as that which the Jews were under, that there is inſtituted a ſeal of entrance into this Covenant, now in the time of the Goſpel, *viz.* Baptiſm. That Baptiſm the ſeal of entrance into the new, is come in the place of Circumciſion the ſeal of entrance into the old (as the new diſpenſation it ſelf ſucceeds the old) and is of the ſame uſe for the main; and that the priviledges of the Goſpel-diſpenſation are more glorious and comfortable then thoſe of the legal were, are truths ſo clear, that he is very ignorant of Scripture (I had almoſt ſaid ſcarce worthy to be called a Chriſtian) that queſtions them, much more that denies them. Col.2.11,12. 2 Cor.3.6,7, 8,9, *&c.* Heb.8 8,9,10

But for the clearing of this truth out of *Geneſis* 17.7. [a] I have written elſewhere, and may further if it be thought needfull, communicate [b] ſome things I have by me for vindication thereof. [a] In my anſwer to *A. R.* [b] In anſwer to *M. T.*

*Arg.*2. Thoſe perſons to whom Chriſt is ſo loving and gracious, that he would have them come or be brought to him, and by no means kept from him, have right to Baptiſm the ſign and pledge of admiſſion to Chriſt: *Arg.*2.

But our Lord Jeſus Chriſt was, and is ſo loving to children of beleeving parents, that he would have them come, or be brought to him, and cannot indure that they ſhould be forbidden or hindred from him, Mat.19.14. Mar.10.14. Luk.18.15,16.

Therefore the children of beleeving parents, have right to Baptiſm the ſign and pledge of admiſſion to Chriſt; and ſo are to be baptized.

For the clearing and confirming of the Propoſition, I will propound ſome few things, which I deſire may be conſidered. 1. That Chriſt refuſed commerce with, or admittance of any perſons to him with kinde entertainment, but ſuch as were in Covenant, at leaſt externally or in a way thereto, by their attentive hearkning to his word and receiving his doctrine. He tels the woman of *Canaan* that he was *not ſent but to the loſt ſheep of the houſe of Iſrael*, and that the childrens bread was not to be given to dogs; implying that the *Canaanites* out of Covenant were as dogs, and not to be entertained by him; neither doth he give any comfortable anſwer to that woman, untill ſhe had diſcovered by her faith, that ſhe had right to Chriſt and the Covenant. The woman of *Samaria* indeed was received by Chriſt as ready to hear his doctrine and be humbled. *Pilate* and *Herod*, he would hardly or not at all anſwer, much leſſe, familiarly and kindly invite to him. Therefore whom Chriſt ſo kindly invites, he looks on, not as aliens to the Covenant, but as having ſome intereſt in himſelf, and the ſign of admiſſion to himſelf and the Covenant. Mat.15.23,24 25,28. Ioh.4.25,26

2. We are ſaid in Baptiſm to put on Chriſt, be baptized into Chriſt and his death, and to be buried with him, which is for ſubſtance as much as to come to him, and by coming unto him to be partakers of him and have Communion with him. Rom.6.3,4. Gal.3.27. Col.2.12. Ioh.5.40.

3. There is now no viſible way for children to come to Chriſt, ſince his aſcenſion ordinarily, but by Baptiſm, that being the firſt viſible way of admiſſion to Chriſt (and that this coming of children was not confined to thoſe children, or that time of his humiliation, will appear by the reaſon, *for theirs is the Kingdom of God*, but the Kingdom of God is diſpenſed ſince Chriſts aſcen-

sion, Therefore children must come; of which anon.) Of coming to Christ in hearing the word, prayer, the Lords Supper, they are uncapable; of inward invisible coming to or being united to Christ, we speak not now, neither doth Christ here speak of it. But by Baptism now, as heretofore by Circumcision, Infants may be brought to Christ and the Covenant in a visible manner.

For the illustration and strengthening of the assumption, let these things be considered. 1. These were properly little children or Infants which Christ would have brought to him and not hindered; as may appear, 1. By their titles, Little children, Young children, Infants. 2. By Christs manner of receiving them, viz. in his arms, which is proper to babes.

παιδία, βρέφη, νήπιον.

2. They were children of beleeving parents in Covenant: 1. It's out of question they were children of Jews, at least, by outward profession of Religion, which then were the peculiar people of God. 2. They which brought them, whether parents or other appointed by them, had a reverend perswasion concerning Christ, and beleeved that his blessing might profit the children. 3. Our Saviour approves the act of them that brought them, which he would not, if it had not been done in faith.

Heb. 7. 6.

3. That Christ speaks not only of those children that were then brought to him, but generally of the children of Beleevers (or all parents that are willing to bring their children to Christ) is plain, in that he saith not Suffer those or these (individual) children to come unto me, but *Suffer little children*, generally or indefinitely.

4. And moreover, that these words of Christ are not to be restrained to those children only, or their manner of coming only, or to the time of Christs being on earth; may be gathered, 1. In that all the three Evangelists so carefully and fully set down that History with all its circumstances, and holding forth Christs gracious expressions of his love to little children, which is doubtlesse to shew what is his affection to the Infants of the faithfull at all times; otherwise what profit or comfort were it for Christians to know that Christ was indeed so loving to those Infants at that time, but would never shew afterwards, when in glory, any more respect to Infants of Christians (whiles such) then to the Infants of Infidels? 2. But the reason given by Christ puts the matter out of question, that this expression of his affection to Infants, is not to be restrained to those particular Infants, that manner of coming, and that time of his visible abode on the earth: *For of such*, saith he, *is the Kingdom of God*, or of heaven; implying that so long as God hath a Kingdom of grace on earth, in the administration of the Gospel, and affords ordinary means of bringing people to the Kingdom of glory, so long the children of the faithfull are to come or be brought to Christ in such a way, as they may be acknowledged subjects of this Kingdom, which is by admission to the sign or seal of entrance thereinto.

5. That it is the will and pleasure of Christ that little children in the time of the Gospel, should be brought to him, appears in the text, in three particulars, worthy to be distinctly observed. 1. In that he was much displeased and moved with high indignation against his disciples, which rebuked and discouraged the bringers of the children. Now Christ which was so admirably meek and gentle, would not have been so much moved, if it had not been a great fault in his disciples to hinder Infants from coming to him (It is doubtless a

Matth. 19. Mar. 10. 13. Luk. 18. 15.

wrong

wrong to poor Infants that cannot plead for themſelves, and to pious parents to be checked in ſo good a work, and to the Church of God to have theſe young members cut therefrom, and eſpecially to God and Chriſt and the Goſpel, to ſeek to caſt out Infants from the priviledge of the Covenant of grace, wherein they had been intereſted in the time of the Law.) Though in the diſciples it was more excuſable by ignorance, becauſe likely before this time they had heard nothing expreſſely from Chriſts mouth; to hold forth the priviledges of Infants in the time of the Goſpel (howbeit they might have gathered enough out of the Old Teſtament, if they would have heeded it to have prevented this miſcarriage, elſe Chriſt would not have been ſo angry with them, if it had been out of invincible ignorance.) Now if Chriſt was ſo offended with this firſt failing of his diſciples through ignorance, what may they expect that after this warning continue clamouring againſt and reproaching the bringing of Infants to Chriſt?

2. Chriſt gives an expreſs command to ſuffer little children to come to him, Αφετε τα παιδια let not any that profeſſe obedience to Chriſt, and acknowledge his ſoveraignty διε ερχεσθαι over them, dare to violate this command, in not ſuffering children to come προς με. Chriſt.

3. Chriſt adds, Forbid them not, which charge, by way of addition, doth not only ſhew our Lord Chriſts earneſtneſſe in this point, and confirm the former precept; But alſo ſufficiently warns all under pain of his diſpleaſure, that neither by word nor action, policy nor power, they dare to do any thing to hinder the Infants of Beleevers from Chriſt.

My third argument I will draw from the ſame Scripture, which is this:

*Arg.*3. To whom the Kingdom of God (or heaven) belongs now in the time of the Goſpel, to them alſo Baptiſm, which is the ſeal of entrance thereinto, belongs. *Arg.*3.

But to the children of beleeving parents, the Kingdom of God or heaven belongs now in the time of the Goſpel, *Mat.* 19.14. *Mar.* 10.14. *Luk.* 18.16.

Therefore Baptiſm, which now in the times of the Goſpel is the ſeal of entrance into this Kingdom, belongs to the children of beleeving parents.

For the clearing and confirming of the propoſition, let theſe things be noted.

1. That whether by the Kingdom of God (or heaven) be meant a ſtate of grace and profeſſed ſubjection to Chriſt the King of the Church in this life, and the ſtate of the Church Militant under Chriſt, already exhibited in the fleſh, as the word is very frequently [a] uſed: or the Kingdom of glory and ſtate of the Church Triumphant, as it is ſometime [b] uſed: It is all one for our purpoſe, and that argument holds moſt clearly in the former, and moſt ſtrongly in the later ſenſe.

[a] Mat 3.2, Mat 14.17. Mat 11.24, 3.44.47. Mat.21.41. Mat. 25.1,14.
[b] 2 Tim.4.18.

2. That Baptiſm is the ſign, pledge, or ſeal of entrance into a Goſpel ſtate, or Chriſtian Church, is I think out of queſtion on all ſides, and if need were might eaſily be proved by theſe and ſuch like Scriptures, *Mat.*3.2.6, *Mat.* 28. 18,19. *Act.*2.38.40. *Act.*8. & 9. *&c.*

3. Though ſome may have right to this Kingdom, and yet want Baptiſm, as the penitent thief, and ſome may have Baptiſm that have no internal right to the Kingdom of God, and ſpiritual bleſſing ſignified; yet thoſe that have right to the Kingdom of God, holden forth in the Goſpel, have right to Baptiſm; and thoſe that are acknowledged according to the rules of Gods word to

have

have right to this Kingdom, must also be acknowledged to have right to the seal of entrance thereinto.

4. Though only internal right to Gods Kingdom and the priviledges thereof, argue right to, or possession of the inward seal of the spirit; yet external professed, or known right to this Kingdom, and the outward priviledges thereof, so as that persons are according to the Scriptures, acknowledged members and subjects thereof, is sufficient to give Ecclesiastical and external right to the seal of entrance thereinto; as the Jews, whiles they were not actually discovenanted, were the children of the Kingdom; though so wicked as that they were shortly cut off. Therefore let none object, If all the children of Beleevers have right to the Kingdom of God they shall be all saved, But they are not all saved, Therefore all have not right. This is answered by distinction of external right, which gives interest to the external priviledges of the visible Kingdom, and internal right which gives interest in, or implies possession of internal, spiritual and eternal priviledges: The former right all Infants of Beleevers have (and of this we speak now) the later only some peculiar sanctified ones, according to the election of grace, as it is in the case of visible professours and sincere Beleevers.

5. That to whom the Kingdom belongs, to them the seal or sign of entrance belongs, right reason will yield, from the nature of correlatives, there being a clear relation between the thing signified or sealed, and the sign or seal; and the whole current of Scripture speaking of Baptism historically, or doctrinally, sheweth that so soon as any were acknowledged to have right to the benefit signified or sealed, they had right to the sign or seal.

The Assumption is expressely in the text, *Mat.*19.14. *Of such is the Kingdom of heaven.* Mar.10.14. *Of such is the Kingdom of God.* So *Luk.*18.16. speaking of little children; yea *ver.*17. Christ with a serious asseveration asserts, That whosoever receives not the Kingdom of God as a little childe, shall in no wise enter thereinto. And that this is meant, not only of those particular children that were brought to Christ, is plain; 1. From what was said before to the former Argument. 2. From the very words of Christ, he saith not of these little children, as excluding all other, but of such, that is, the children of parents beleeving and in Covenant, as those were, which only the disciples and other men that are not able to see the hearts can judge to be such.

Ob. Here one objecteth, "This reason is grounded on a great mistake of
A. R. "the sense of the text; for the words are not, To such belongs the Kingdom,
"but *Of such is the Kingdom*, that is, of none else but such, as the next words
"which do follow in this text, do manifestly declare, for in *Luk.*18.17. *Mar.*
"10.15. in both places; where Christ had said, *Suffer little children to come to*
"*me, for of such is the Kingdom of God*; he presently confirms it in the next words
"thus, *Verily I say, Whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom of God as a little*
"*childe shall not enter therein*: As also, *Mat.*18.34. Christ speaking to his di-
"sciples saith, *Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not en-*
"*ter into the Kingdom of heaven: Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this*
"*little childe, the same is greatest in the Kingdom of heaven*; his meaning is not
"of them, or such as them in age nor understanding, 1 *Cor.*14.20. but of such
"as them in humility and like qualifications.

Ans. *Ans.* We neither by mistake say nor judge this place is to be rendred, *Unto*
them

them belongs the Kingdom: But the words are, *Of such is* (or *to such belongs*) *the Kingdom*, &c. which makes more for our cause then if it had been said, To them belongs, &c. two waies. 1. Hence it is clear that our Saviour speaks not of those individuall Infants only, but of all such as they. Notwithstanding the Disciples through ignorance (as before the Ascension they had many mistakes about Christs Kingdom) thought (possibly) that such Infants were unfit subjects for the Kingdom of heaven; he peremptorily affirms, that *Of such is the Kingdom of heaven*, indefinitely speaking of such, that their non-age cannot debarre them from this heavenly and spiritual Kingdom. Whereas if Christ had said (of them) it might have been thought that those children brought to Christ, had by extraordinary priviledge or miracle, right to Christs Kingdom: Whereas by our Saviours expression (*such*) it appears to be the common and ordinary priviledge of the children of the faithfull. 2. Whereas Christ saith, *Of such is the Kingdom* (though our Translators render it, *To such belongeth*, because the idiom of our Language will not so well bear the other phrase) it implies, that such are already in the Kingdom of God or visible Church, as subjects and members thereof. Whereas if Christ had said, Belongs to them, It might have been understood for the future in a remote possibility (as the inheritance belongs to the Infant-heir, though he be not in present possession,) *viz.* That when they should come to riper years they might be externally called, and so brought within the Church; whereas this expression of our Saviour shews that such are already within Christs Kingdom. τῶν τοιού-τῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία.

2. Though we should mistake this place, as the objector chargeth us, in that we would gather hence that children are to be admitted to Christ, and have the Seal of spiritual blessings. Whereas he would make it the scope of this place, not that they or such as they in age or understanding have right to the Kingdom of heaven, but such as they in humility and like qualifications; yet it's not like that they which brought the children to Christ should be mistaken in their ends (seeing none of the Evangelists speak of them as mistaken, but rather mention their act by way of approbation) which were for prayer and imposition of hands, to conferre and signifie spiritual blessings, which are the peculiar priviledges of Gods Kingdom. Or if they should so far mistake themselves as to come for Christs blessing for their children, though uncapable, it is not probable but Christ would have reproved them for their errour before he admitted them, and have told them, that he would receive them to him only that they might be patterns of humility and such like qualifications to his Disciples; but not so, as if the Kingdom of heaven did belong to them or such as they were in age and understanding, lest he should harden them in their errour. But if Christ should have forborn to tell them of their errour, and make use of it that he might set before his hearers a pattern of humility and such qualifications; yet surely Christ himself would not so far mistake, as to lay his hands on, and blesse them that were uncapable of his blessing, as they must needs be if the Kingdom of heaven belonged not to them, nor any such for age; for Christs blessing of persons, so solemnly represented and signified or sealed with imposition of hands, are doubtlesse the priviledges of his Kingdom: so that this charge of mistake which the Objector makes, must lie on the Objector himself or Christ.

3. It cannot be proved that these words, *Whosoever receives not*, &c. are

brought as a reason of that saying, *Of such is the Kingdom:* It is not joyned to the former sentence by a causall particle. But rather it is brought as a second reason why they are to be brought and admitted to Christ, because they are not only fit subjects of the Kingdom of heaven, but also may be patterns to the more ripe and aged.

4. That place, *Mat.* 18.34. nothing pertains to this History, for it speaks of Christs teaching his Disciples humility (of which doctrine he took occasion from his Disciples pride and emulation, which discovered it self in that question, *Who is greatest in the Kingdom?*) by setting in the midst of them (there's no mention of taking in his arms) a little childe; and therefore though this sentence may somewhat illustrate the later of these reasons in *Mark* and *Luke*, yet it belongs not to this History or doctrine that is principally and purposely handled therein.

5. But to make it evident, that Christ when he saith, *Of such is the Kingdom*, means it of these very children and such as they in respect of age, take these reasons.

1. The Question was not, Whether such as were indued with humility and like qualifications, might come to Christ? but Whether those Infants, and such as they for age might? The parents or whosoever brought them (whose piety is here approved) desired not that those that had such qualifications only as their children, but that those very babes might be admitted to Christ for prayer and laying on of his hands. The Disciples rebuked them for bringing (not humble persons of ripe years and otherwise qualified as children, but) those babes: Christ is angry with them for hindering those very children, pleads for the children and the bringers of them, commandeth that the children should be permitted to come to him (not such as them in humility and like qualifications at this time) and gives this reason, *For of such is the Kingdom of heaven.* Now how were this speech and reason of Christ pertinent or convincing, if when the question was about little ones, he should speak only of those which were endued with humility and such qualifications, yet of ripe years?

2. The word *such* is taken most usually in Scripture (if not alwaies) for the same persons or things of which mention was made immediatly before, and those that are of the same nature and kinde, not those of different kinde or form, that only agree in some remote unquestioned, unmentioned qualifications; as may appear by these and such like Scriptures, *Joh* 4.23. *But the hour cometh and now is when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in Spirit and truth, for the Father seeketh such to worship him.* 1 Cor 5.5. *To deliver such an one to Satan*; this is meant of the incestuous man (of whom the Apostle had spoken before,) and of those that were guilty of the same or like sins as he: so 2 *Cor.* 12.2. *Such an one taken up into the third heaven.* vers. 3. *I know such a man.* ver. 5. *Concerning such a man I will glory.* It's plain that this is spoken of the man that had Visions and Revelations of God, whether in the body or out of the body he knew not; and that *Paul* would glory of that very man or such others, for whom God had done such things, as none of the false Apostles could glory of the like. The same may be observed, *Gal.* 5.21. *Heb.* 7.26. and *Heb.* 13.16. By which examples it is plain, that though the word *(such)* in the English tongue often signifies but similitude, yet in the Original it notes entity, both specifical

τοιοῦτος, τοιαῦτα.

specifical and numerical, and consequently here are not meant those who were only like babes in humility and such qualifications, but those very Infants that were brought, and other such Infants, *viz.* of the Church.

3. If therefore only Christ admitted children, took them in his arms, laid his hands on them, and blessed them, because of their humility and such qualifications, wherein these that will enter into the Kingdom of God must resemble them; not because they themselves had interrest in the Kingdom of God, and were capable of spiritual blessings; then it will follow that it had been lawfull and commendable, for men to have brought to Christ Sheep, Doves or Serpents, Salt, Lights or Vine-branches, good Wheat, or good Fish, to have him put his hands upon them and prayed for them, and that Christ would have taken these all, or any of them, into his arms or hands, laid his hands on them and blessed them, for the Godly are resembled to these, and we required to be like unto them in some qualifications, as we will be saved; and where the same or like cause is, the same or like effect will follow: But the consequent is absurd and ridiculous (if not blasphemous) Therefore the antecedent is false. I come now to the third Argument taken from this History, and it is my fourth Argument in order.

Mat 5.13,14. Mat. 10 16. Ioh. 10,14. Mat.13. Ioh.13.1,16.

Arg. 4. Those and such as those to whom Christ hath vouchsafed his dear imbraces, prayers, blessing, and imposition of hands, as a sign or pledge of his blessing, are doubtlesse in Covenant, and have right to the sign or pledge of entrance thereinto, which is Baptism now in time of the Gospel:

Arg. 4.

But Christ hath vouchsafed the little children of the faithfull his dear imbraces, prayed for them, blessed them, and laid his hands on them as a sign or pledge of his blessing;

Mat.10.13.15. Mat.10,16.

Therefore the children of the faithfull are in Covenant, and have right to the seal of entrance thereinto, which is Baptism.

To the clearing of the Proposition let it be remembred, 1. The tender imbraces of Christ and ready entertainments of persons, argue those to be in Covenant and in his favour whom he so entertaineth. For he that forbad his Disciples to go to the Gentiles and Samaritans, was not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of *Israel*, would not have eaten with publicans and sinners, but as they had been lost sheep and prodigall sons, yet sheep and sons found again, which had been humbed by *Johns* Ministry; would not doubtlesse tenderly imbrace any young or old, that were without God, hope, Christ or Covenant.

Mat.10.5. Mat.15.24. Luk 7.29. Luk 15.1,2,3.

2. These whom Christ prayeth for are not of the world, and therefore called out of the world to the Church and Covenant, *Joh.* 17.9.

3. Christs laying on of his hands being a sign or seal of spiritual blessing (for we reade not that these children were brought to be cured of any corporal malady; but Christs saying, *Of such is the Kingdom of God*, sufficiently implieth, that the blessings which he bestowed and confirmed to them, by laying on of hands, were blessings of his Kingdom, which are principally not corporal but spiritual) was of the same nature or equivalent to, or at least implied right in Baptism: For we never reade that God or Christ, or any by Divine appointment, communicated imposition of hands as a sign of the blessings of his Kingdom to unbeleevers and persons out of Covenant, and so uninterested in the seal of entrance into Covenant.

Rom.14.17.

 4. Hence

4. Hence follows, each of these favours of Christ, much more all laid together, prove, that those to whom they are vouchsafed, are in Covenant, and so have title to the pledge of admission thereto.

As to the Assumption, let it be noted, 1. That it is in the very words of the text. 2. That though this priviledge of corporal or visible imbracing, and laying on of hands, and vocal or audible prayer, and blessing from Christ, was peculiar to those Infants that were then brought to him; yet that the same blessings for substance invisibly and spiritually to be conferred by Christ, and what is equivalent to these outward signs, belong still to children of Beleevers under the Gospel, may be gathered from the whole context, is partly cleared in the handling of the two former Arguments, and might be further proved if need were, and intended brevity would suffer.

Arg. 5. *Arg.* 5. If all Nations were by the Apostles to be made disciples and baptized, then the children of those in the Nations, by whom the Gospel is received; for children are a very great and considerable part of a Nation, and capable of being made disciples; as was shewed in answer to the former Paper:

But all Nations were to be made disciples and baptized by the Apostles, according to the command of Jesus Christ, *Mat.* 28.19,20.

Therefore the children of beleeving parents in those Nations, were and still are to be baptized.

In Answer to *A. R.* In Answer to the first Paper. For the clearing of this Argument I might suffice my self in referring the Reader to what I have written heretofore, for the vindicating of this Scripture, *Mat.* 28.19 which is the ground of this Argument. Yet briefly for the strengthening and clearing of the antecedent or Assumption contained in the text, I shall propound these considerations to be remembred, though some of them were touched before.

1. That children are a very considerable part of Nations, therefore comprehended under this command of discipling and baptizing Nations: Especially considering,

2. That no acception is made of them; neither doth this or any other Scripture shew that they must be excluded out of this Commission. Did ever Christ say or intimate thus much, Though the children of Beleevers have heretofore been in Covenant and admitted to the sign of entrance thereto, yet now in the time of the Gospel they are to be left out of Covenant, and kept from the seals thereof, as Infidels and Pagans, till they professe their faith?

3. They are not uncapable of being made disciples and baptized, as hath been said.

Gen. 17.7. Exod. 12.48. 4. That one Nation of the Jews, which unto the time of Christs giving this Commission to his Disciples, had been in Covenant and enjoyed the seals thereof, as his peculiar people, had their children taken into Covenant with them, and admitted to the seal of entrance; which priviledge also Proselytes of other Nations had in common with the Jews.

5. Not only among the Jews, but also in all Nations Infant-children were alwaies devoted to the same God and religion as their parents, and often (if not alwaies) by some solemn sign of initiation, the devil (not unfitly called Gods ape) would have children with their parents dedicated to him, *Lev.* 18.21. compared with 24,25,26. and it is so universal, that children, while Infants, are still reputed to belong to the same religion and God with their parents; as

that

that the children of Papists, Jews, Turks and Indians, &c. are accounted from their mothers womb, Papist, Jews, Turks and Indians, &c. untill by the use of reason and free-will they make defection from their fathers religion; so that it seems to be of the very dictate of reason and law of nature, that Infants should be esteemed to belong to the same God and religion as their parents, whether true or false.

6. The children of subjects and bondslaves, are accounted the subjects and bondslaves to their Parents Sovereigns and Masters, untill by some act of their own they cast off their yoke: Now all Christians are subjects and servants to Christ their King and Lord, therefore their children also are subjects and servants to God and Christ, whiles Infants, *Lev.*25.41,42. *Psal.*116.16.

7. Hence it cannot be rationally conceived that the Apostles did understand the Commission of discipling all Nations, otherwise then so as to take in the children with their beleeving parents.

*Arg.*6. If all the Nations of the earth shall be blessed by Christ the seed of *Abraham*, after his coming in the flesh, as much or more then the Nation of the Jews were before the coming of Christ, then surely the children of converted Nations must be in Covenant, and have right to the seal of entrance thereinto, for this was a great priviledge of the Jewish Nation before Christs coming. It would be an horrible eclipsing of the blessednesse of the converted Gentiles, and of the Jews when they shall be converted, to have their children cut off from the Covenant and the seal thereof: *Arg.*6.

But the Nations of beleeving Gentiles shall be blessed as much or more in the time of the Gospel by Christ, then the Jews were before his coming, *Gen.* 22.18. *Gal.*3.8. 2 *Cor.*3.7,8,9. *Heb.*8.6,7.

Therefore the children of beleeving Gentiles have right to the Covenant and seal of admittance thereinto, which is Baptism.

For the fuller discovery of the strength of this Argument consider 4 things.

1. What is said on the foregoing Argument, is of use here also, for the clearing of the extent and comprehensiveness of the word *Nation*.

2. Consider the several confirmations of the Proposition, tending to clear the consequence. 1. The Jews (as hath been said) had interest in the Covenant and seal of admission for their children in the Old Testament, before Christs coming, and this was in it self and their account doubtlesse a glorious priviledge; Therefore Christians after Christs coming must have the same priviledge, seeing no lesse but rather greater priviledges are promised to the beleeving Gentiles then the Jews had. 2. Especially considering that now in the time of the Gospel this would be in it self, and in the apprehension and desire of all godly parents, accounted a most glorious priviledge now, that their children should be in Covenant and admitted to the seal thereof, and the contrary a fearfull losse. I appeal to all that esteem the Covenant of God, whether next to their own salvation they would not esteem their childrens being admitted to the Covenant of God and its seal an eminent priviledge (what those that through the spirit of errour have cast off God, his Covenant and truth, judge, we weigh not, considering they are given over to a reprobate judgement.) It being unconceivable how those that ever tasted the goodnesse of God, the priviledges of the Covenant, and made right improvement of the seal thereof, should not earnestly desire the same for their children, whom na-

ture and grace teacheth dearly to love. Neither can any reason be given, why this should be so great a priviledge before Christ, and not remain a most desirable priviledge since Christs coming, for parents to have their children in Gods Covenant and under his seal. 3. Hence follows, that it would be a sad eclipsing of the blessednesse, comfort and glory of beleeving Gentiles, if their children should be dashed out from the priviledges of the Covenant, which the Jews children had. How could that of the Apostle be true (*Rom.*3.29. *Is he the God of Jews only, is he not also of the Gentiles? yea of the Gentiles also,*) if God have not as well taken the Gentiles with their children into Covenant, as well as heretofore the Jews with their children. How should the converted Gentiles rejoice with Gods people and praise him, as well as the Jews, according to the Prophecie cited by the Apostle, *Rom.*15.10,15. if they should be deprived of so grand a priviledge of Gods people, which had been so long possessed by them, and their Infants left out of Covenant and debarred the seal? 4. What a lamentable fall and abatement of the beleeving Jews comfort and glory, would befall them by the coming of Christ, contrary to the Prophetical predictions, Evangelical Proclamations, and all the faithfuls expectation; if whereas before Christs coming their little ones were in Covenant, had God for their God, and were sealed with the sign of the Covenant; now upon this imbracing of Christ, whether on the first offer of the Gospel to them by the Apostles as in *Act.*2. or at their conversion in the latter end of the world, *Rom.* 11. their Infant-children should be left out of the Covenant, in Satans Kingdome.

*Act.*2. 37,38, 39,40,&c. *Rom.*7 26,27

3. I will answer one Objection (once for all) which may seem to have some force to take away those untheological and unevangelical absurdities that these men fall into, which here and elsewhere it's shewed their opinion leads them to: it's this.

Obj. In the Old Testament indeed the Church had many external visible priviledges, consisting in Rites and Ceremonies, and therefore they were circumcised and their children; but now in the Gospel the priviledges are more spiritual and invisible, and therefore it will not follow, If some of those visible priviledges be withdrawn, that the Gospel-dispensation is not more excellent then the Legal, and so if Baptism be denied to Christians children, that their state is worse then the state of the Jews.

Ans. This Objection which would seem to take off the former absurdities, will appear anon to bring in other absurdities as great or greater, or leave the force of the former Arguments untouched. For though it be true that amongst the Jews was a worldly Sanctuary and carnal ordinances, *Heb.*9.1.10. which are now abolished and no visible ordinance left to Christians in the place thereof: Yet generally to say that Jews priviledges consisted in Rites and Ceremonies, and Christians are spiritual and invisible, is to deny spiritual priviledges to the Jews, and the outward profession of religion to Christians, which is equally to overthrow the power of godlinesse and truth of religion in both, then which what more dangerous or absurd?

2. But if they will leave generals and come to the point in hand, they must either deny that there is any such outward ordinance as Baptism left to the Church of the New Testament, being of the same use for the main, and in the place of Circumcision, *Col.*2.11,12. which to do were to contradict plain Scripture,

Scripture, or if they grant it, their ſhifting diſtinction of viſible and ſpiritual priviledges cannot help them, for here by their own conceſſion it cannot take place, ſeeing that they yield that in this caſe a viſible priviledge is afforded alike to both Churches, Jewiſh and Chriſtian.

3. This Objection ſhould be acknowledged to ſay ſomething to the purpoſe, if it could be proved, 1. That the Jews were only under an external Covenant, without ſpiritual graces. 2. That their priviledges were only external. 3. That Chriſtians have now only ſpiritual bleſſings beſtowed on them. 4. That ordinarily God now gives his Covenant and ſpiritual bleſſings thereof without any viſible means or external way of diſpenſing the ſame. All or any of which to aſſert were very falſe and wicked. But when it is acknowledged, or at leaſt may by plentifull Scripture be proved, 1. That the Jews and their children had intereſt in ſpiritual bleſſings of the Covenant, as truly as we, though in a different manner and meaſure. 1. 2. That we Chriſtians are under a viſible diſpenſation, as well as they. 2. 3. That both diſpenſations have had alike each a viſible ſign, ſeal or pledge of admiſſion into Covenant. 3. 4. That to enjoy theſe ſigns and ſeals, have been and ſtill are a great benefit to them that have them according to Gods appointment. 4. 5. That now Beleevers have need of the ſeals of the Covenant to them and their children to confirm their faith in Gods mercy to them and theirs, and ingage and incite them to obedience, as well as the beleeving Jews. 5.

That for themſelves Beleevers need a ſeal or pledge, is granted by all parties that acknowledge that God (who inſtitutes nothing needleſſe or ſuperfluous in his Church) hath inſtituted Baptiſme as a ſtanding Ordinance for Chriſtians. And that for their children they need a ſeal, as well as the Jews for their children, or Chriſtian Profeſſours for themſelves, may appear thus: 1. Have not Chriſtians children ſouls capable of ſalvation as well as the Jews? 1. 2. Is it not for Gods glory to be viſibly known the God of Chriſtians children as well as of the Jews? 2. 3. Are Chriſtian parents better able to beleeve Gods fatherly federall love to their children, and devote them to his worſhip, without his applying a ſeal unto them, then they can beleeve his love to themſelves, and devote themſelves to God without a ſeal or pledge? If they can ſufficiently beleeve in God for their children, and devote them to Chriſt without the ſeal for a pledge or ingagement, ſurely they might as well have beleeved and obeyed without a ſeal for themſelves, if ſo, no ſeal had been inſtituted at all; for God will make no ſuperfluous inſtitutions. But a ſeal is inſtituted, therefore they needed it, if for themſelves then for their children. 3. 4. Are Chriſtian parents more careleſſe of their childrens ſalvation or Gods being glorified by their children then the Jews were? that none may ſay: Then ſure they no leſſe need to ſee them ſealed into the Covenant wherein they may be ingaged to glorifie God, and God to ſave their ſouls. Or 5. Have Chriſtians more obſcure and ſparing diſcovery by promiſe and precept concerning their own priviledges and duties, that they ſhould need the ſeal and pledge of Baptiſm for themſelves; but more full and clearer promiſes and commands concerning their childrens priviledges and duties, then either the Jews had for their children or Chriſtian Profeſſours have for themſelves, that in the caſe of Chriſtians children there ſhould be no uſe of a ſeal and pledge, though the Jews children did and Chriſtian Profeſſours do need a ſeal? I think none will ſay this. 6. That no Scripture 4. 5. 6.

pture or reason can be given to prove that Beleevers children in the time of the Gospel are debarred from the Covenant and seal thereof (of which the beleeving Jews children had been long in possession) and some more eminent priviledge bestowed on Christians children, which the Jews children never had, to compensate that losse, of being driven from the Covenant and seal; when (I say) these six things are at the least for the greater part acknowledged, and the other may be easily proved, at least so many as are necessary for this purpose; it must needs be a very contradictory thing, to say That the Gospel-dispensation is more glorious and comfortable then the Legal, and beleeving Gentiles as much or more blessed then the Jews, and yet Christians children driven from the Covenant of grace and seal thereof, which the Jews children were under.

4. Having first propounded something in general for the clearing of the whole Argument; secondly, confirmed the Proposition by some particulars: thirdly, Answered an Objection: fourthly, I come to the fourth thing which I promised, which is to speak of the Assumption; concerning which I need say no more, then that it is plainly and fully proved in the Scriptures mentioned in the proposal of the Assumption, and divers others setting forth the glory of Gospel-times.

*Arg.*7. *Arg.*7. To whom the promise of the spiritual blessing represented and seal-
Act.2.38,39. ed in Baptism belongs, to them the outward sign of Baptism it self belongs; so the Apostle reasons, and the sign and thing signified being correlatives, must go together:

Act.2.39. But the promise of Gods Spirit, signified in Baptism (and so of Rege-
Isa.44.3. neration, Sanctification and Adoption) belongs to the faithfull and their children;

Therefore Baptism it self belongs to them.

*Arg.*8. *Arg.*8. If in the time of the Apostles, when the gouernours of families beleeved, their whole families thereupon were baptized with them: Now also the children of beleeving parents, being parts of their families, are to be baptized:

But where the Apostles had drawn, by the Ministry of the word, governours of families to the faith, they baptized with them their whole family, *Act.*16.14,15. & 33,34.

Therefore the children of beleeving parents are to be baptized.

For the clearing of the two last Arguments, to avoid tediousnesse (having been more large in the former then I intended) I refer the Reader to what I have said in the Answer to the former Paper, in the vindicating of those Scriptures, *Act.*2. & 16. cited by the other party.

*Arg.*9. *Arg.*9. They that are holy or Saints, are to be baptized:

Children of beleeving parents are holy or Saints, 1 *Cor.*7.14.

Therefore to be baptized.

See this Argument cleared in my first Book, in Answer to *A.R.* and hereafter more may come forth for vindicating of that Scripture, 1 *Cor.*7.14. from exceptions.

*Arg.*10. *Arg.*10. They that are members of the Church have right to Baptism, for Baptism is a solemn sign or pledge of admittance into the Church, 1 *Cor.*12. 12,13. *Eph.*5.25,26.

But

But the children of the faithfull are members of the Church. 1. So they were amongst the *Iſraelites* and never yet diſmembred. 2. Such promiſes are made to them as none without the Church have right unto. 3. Elſe they have no intereſt in Chriſts love, no benefit by his death, no purification and ſanctification by his bloud, nor is there any hope that (if they die Infants) they ſhall be preſented holy and ſpotleſſe, glorious and unblamable before God, all which are the peculiar priviledges of the Church, not communicable to any but members thereof, *Eph.*4.25,26,27. So that if the children of Beleevers be not members of the Church, they are without, Aliens from the Commonwealth of *Iſrael*, without hope, without God, whiles children, which to affirm, is moſt blaſphemous to Gods grace, Covenant and nature.

Therefore the children of Beleevers have right to Baptiſm.

*Arg.*11. If the duties of the Covenant no leſſe belong to Chriſtian parents and their children in the time of the Goſpel, then they did to Jewiſh parents and their children under the Law: It will follow that the Covenant it ſelf and the priviledges and ſeal thereof, do no leſſe belong to them and their children, then they did to the Jews and their children: *Arg.*11.

But the duties of the Covenant lie no leſſe on Chriſtian parents, to teach and inſtruct their children, and on their children to learn the fear and nurture of the Lord, now in the time of the Goſpel, then they lay on Jewiſh parents and children; Eph.6.4.

Therefore the Covenant, its priviledges, and the ſeal of admiſſion no leſſe belongs to Chriſtian parents and their children, then they did belong to Jewiſh parents and their children.

For the ſtrengthening of the Propoſition let theſe things be conſidered,

1. Ordinarily and in the uſual diſpenſation of the Covenant, where God requires like duties, he affords like priviledges: I ſpeak not of what God may do out of his prerogative or in ſome extraordinary caſe, ſetting aſide his dealing with men by way of command, promiſe and threatning, which is his way of tranſaction in Covenant.

2. If there be any difference in the Chriſtian Church compared with the Jewiſh, and later diſpenſation of the Covenant compared with the former, there is rather an increaſe of priviledges, and leſſening of burdens and duties, then an increaſe of burdens and duties and leſſening of priviledges.

3. If you ſay otherwiſe, Might not Chriſtian parents, if urged to the Religious education of their children by you, anſwer, By your judgement they are dogs and ſwine, as being out of Covenant? how can we offer holy inſtruction to them, or exerciſe any Chriſtian diſcipline over them, bring them to publick aſſemblies, or pray for them, any otherwiſe then as Infidels? were not this to caſt Pearls to ſwine, and give holy things to dogs? What have we to do to pray with or exerciſe Diſcipline and Cenſure over thoſe that are without? What poor incouragements do you give us to bring them up for God, when you tell us that they have no right to the Covenant of God? Is not your practice in denying us the priviledge of the Covenant for our children, and yet requiring the duties thereof, worſe then that of the falſe Apoſtles, in putting a yoke on the Diſciples necks, which neither their fathers nor they were able to bear? They indeed urged duties, but allowed priviledges (according to their apprehenſion, and what had formerly been indeed a priviledge,) you urge du- Mat.7.6. 1 Cor.5.12.

ty, but deny priviledges, which do greatly ease burdens and facilitate duties. But if you say, that you do not urge the duty of Christian education of children, &c. as I fear practice speaks too loud: What is this but to professe an intention to overthrow both the duties and priviledges of the Covenant, and so bring in Atheism, which if it take place in families, will soon overspread the whole Church, and particular persons.

4. The Jews indeed were bound to circumcise their children, and observe all those laws, Ceremonial and Moral, concerning them which were appointed by *Moses*; but they had this ease and encouragement, their children were in Covenant and had the seal thereof, and they might expect the priviledges and blessings of the Covenant on their children, by vertue of Gods promises, Covenant and seal. Now no such priviledges are allow'd to Christian parents in behalf of their children, if these mens opinion stand and the Proposition hold not.

Obj. But if parents by their care bring them to actual faith, and so under the Covenant, then they shall enjoy the priviledges of the Covenant, and seal thereof.

Ans. 1. If that be all, then by your opinion if they dye before actual faith (as thousands of the children of the faithfull do in their infancy) they perish as Aliens to the Covenant. 2. The only way revealed in Scripture for parents first bringing their children under the Covenant, is by faith to accept the Covenant for themselves and their children, *Gen.* 17.7. They that hold our a new way must shew some Scripture for the abolishing of the Old, and establishing the New, or must expect no regard from those that are not willing to be deluded. 3. Shew the ground of this distinction; Jewish children were to be educated for God as being under Covenant and seal, but the children of Christians only that they may be brought under the Covenant and seal, when they come to actual faith, professed in their own person. What Scripture or reason puts such a vast difference between them, that those should be brought up Religiously, as actually in Covenant and sealed, these only as in a remote possibility to be brought to the Covenant and seal?

5. The fifth consideration will not only strengthen the Proposition, but also further answer the foregoing objection: It's this, If the children of the faithfull be not already actually in Covenant, from their infancy, and so interested in the priviledges of the Covenant, not only parents may be afraid to instruct them in Scripture, Catechise and pray with them, require their presence in the Congregation and family duties, and their sanctification of the Lords day (which are both duties and priviledges of the Covenant) least they should cast Pearls to swine, and judge them that are without; But also the children, if urged hereunto, may demand of their parents, What have you to do to require of us any Christian duties, or to correct us for the neglect thereof, or for the commission of any sin against the Gospel, as profanation of the Lords day, blaspheming Christ, Christian Religion, or the Scripture, &c. Might not they plead liberty of conscience, and say, What have you to do to judge us that are without? we are to chuse our Religion, and as free to worship Mahomet as Christ. The Jews indeed had authority to bring up their children in the Jewish Religion, as being devoted thereto from their infancy, by the Covenant and seal thereof, under which they were: but now we children of Christians

are

are under no such priviledges nor ingagements. Which practice, I fear, will be the genuine fruit of this opinion, argued against and swallowed down as no absurdity, by those that are poisoned with Anabaptisticall fancies; but must needs be detested by all that prize the Covenant of God, and love Christ sincerely, or their own and childrens souls spiritually.

To clear the Assumption, let these things be considered:

1. How can it be doubted but that all those morall duties that lay upon *Abraham* and his children, and the *Israelites* and their children, enjoining the one party to teach, and the other to learn the way and commandments of God, lye now upon Christian parents and their children. Gen. 18.19. Exod. 12.26, 27. Iosh 24.15. Psal. 78.5,6.

2. *Paul* greatly commends *Timothies* happinesse, and his parents care in that he had been brought up from his infancy in holy Scripture, which he would not have done, if either *Timothy* had not been in Covenant from his infancy (for what have those to do with the tables of the Covenant, that are strangers or aliens to the Covenant?) or that example had not been of moral equity to be imitated by Christian parents and their children, in the time of the Gospel. Prov. 4.3,4,5. 2 Tim. 3.15.

3. That Scripture cited to prove the Assumption, contains a full expresse charge which lies on all Christian parents to teach, and children to learn the fear and information of the Lord, *Eph.6.4.* which argues also that children of the faithfull are disciples of the Lord, to be trained up in his school, being dedicated to his discipline and nurture. ἐκτρέφετε αὐτὰ ἐν παιδείᾳ καὶ νουθεσίᾳ Κυρίου,

4. Were not this so, that moral Law, which the Apostle in special manner above all the rest, urgeth upon Christians children, would be abrogated, or greatly weakened as to the children of Christian parents, at least untill they come to actual faith. *Children* (saith he) *obey your parents in the Lord.* And *Honour thy father and mother, which is the first commandment with promise.* For how can they obey them in the Lord, when the parents have no authority to command them any thing in the name of the Lord, they not being under his yoke and Covenant? How can parents challenge honour from their children by virtue of Gods command, when they bring not up their children for God and to his honour? Or how can children Religiously and Christianly honour their parents, that have left them in the state of Infidels? Especially considering this commandment, *Honour thy father*, &c. as it was given to the *Israelites*, supposed their children to be in Covenant with their parents, and to have the like interest with their parents in the Covenant and its seal, and the like ingagement to the duties thereof, in respect of outward dispensation, which is denied now to the children of Christians, unlesse the Assumption, yea and the main point in controversie be granted. Eph 6,1,2.

Twelfthly, I argue thus: Children of beleeving parents must either be baptized, while children, or while able to professe the faith, or not at all. 1. This last your practice shews you will not hold; and it were unreasonable to think that their being born of beleeving parents should deprive them of this priviledge, seeing in the Old Testament this procured to children the seal of entrance. 2. That they should be kept without Baptism untill they be able to make a profession of faith, is no where commanded, neither can any Scripture-example, or good reason be given for it. 1. Not commanded, for the command which was given for baptizing of professours of faith and repentance, did expressely and immediatly belong to those Jews and Gentiles which had not *Arg.12.*

 been

been born of Christian parents. 2. Neither is there Scripture-example for it, for the examples we reade of were according to Commission, none (as we reade in Scripture) that were born after their parents were Christians, were baptized, when grown; Scripture speaks only of those that had been Jews and Infidels children that were baptized by the Apostles. 3. Neither stands it with right reason, that Beleevers children should be left (untill they professe their faith) in the same state with Jews, Turks and Infidels, considering Gods promises and Covenant:

Therefore it remains that they must be baptized while Infants; this being most agreeable, 1. To Gods dealing with *Abraham* the father of the faithfull, that children, while Infants, should be admitted with their beleeving parents, and that Covenant and seal thereof. 2. To the nature of this Sacrament, which is to be administred the first opportunity, to persons known to be in Covenant, and members of the Church. 3. To all those commands and examples of baptizing new converted Jews and Infidels; for as their conversion did put them into the Covenant of grace, whereupon they had right to the seal of entrance: So these Infants being born of Christian parents, doth inright them to the Covenant, whereupon they have right to the seal of entrance.

*Arg.*13. *Arg.*13. That doctrine and practice is to be abhorred, which puts the Infants of Christians into the same condition with the children of Turks and Infidels, leaves them in the visible kingdom of the devil, as no visible members of the Church, denies to them reasonable souls, and cuts them off from all hopes of salvation, whiles they are Infants: This doctrine and practice, I say, is to be abhorred, as most contrary to the Covenant of God set forth in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, contrary to the hopes, prayers, and comforts of Christian parents concerning their children, while Infants, and contrary to reasons and natures light, which shews that Infants are reasonable creatures.

But the doctrine and practice of these Anabaptists, leaves Christians children in the same condition with the children of Turks and Infidels, as casting them out of Gods Covenant and Christs Kingdom, which is the Church, and denying to them the seal of admittance thereto, and so leaving them in the visible kingdom of the devil, denying to them faith, without which they must certainly perish; and reason, without which they are bruits, and so cut off from all hopes of salvation.

Therefore their doctrine and practice is to be abhorred.

Thus you have seen our Arguments, or at least some of them.

Now before I conclude I will Answer two or three Questions or Objections.

*Obj.*1. But if children of Beleevers have right to the Covenant, Christ, the promises, and gift of the holy Ghost, How can we know this? Men of years if they beleeve and repent, can make profession; but how can children make profession in the Covenant, that we may have sufficient warrant to baptize them?

Ans. It's true they cannot make profession of their interest in the Covenant and promises, but that is done sufficiently for them, by God the Father, Son and holy Ghost, speaking in Scripture, as *Gen.*17.7. *Exod.*20.6. *Psal.*102.28. and 103.17,18. *Psal.*112.2. and 127.3,4,5. *Es.*44.3. *Mar.*10.14. *Act.*2.39. 1 *Cor.*2.14, *&c.* These and many other Testimonies are given in Scripture by God himself, concerning the right of the faithfuls children to the Covenant,

promise

promiſe and Kingdom of God, which I wiſh the Reader to turn over unto and obſerve: Surely this teſtimony of God for children, is not leſſe then the teſtimony of men of years for themſelves. So that if parents when they bring their children to Baptiſm, make a due profeſſion of their repentance, faith and reſolution to walk with God in Covenant, and both to accept Gods Covenant for themſelves and their children, and give up themſelves and theirs to God in Covenant, the Miniſters and Congregations may have ſatisfaction concerning their childrens right to the Covenant and promiſe (by vertue of theſe Scriptures) and ſo to Baptiſm.

Obj. 2. If children of beleeving parents have title to the Covenant and promiſes, either all have this title or ſome only: If ſome only, how will you diſtinguiſh them, that thoſe only may be baptized? If all, how is it that many prove wicked, which were baptized in infancy? Do you hold falling away from grace?

Anſ. The promiſes and Covenant belong to all the faithfuls children in regard of outward ſtation in Covenant, and right to the ſeal of entrance (which is the thing now in queſtion) the inward efficacy we leave to the good pleaſure of God. The whole body of *Iſraelites* aged and children, were Gods people by Covenant, and under the promiſe; *Yet with many of them God was not well pleaſed.* The Churches of the New Teſtament are called Saints, ſaid to be in Chriſt, and yet many perſons therein proved wicked and erroneous; as may appear in thoſe Epiſtles that are written to them, giving them the title of Saints. The Covenant and promiſes as they are outwardly diſpenſed are conditional, neither doth God therein any further binde himſelf to his people, then as the condition of regeneration, holineſſe, repentance, faith or obedience, are found in them or performed by them. Indeed the inward working of regeneration, drawing to and giving Communion with Chriſt, giving a new heart and ſpirit, faith, *&c.* are abſolutely beſtowed according to Gods good pleaſure, upon what number of theſe perſons externally in Covenant he ſeeth good, according to the election of grace, agreeably to thoſe Scriptures, *Rom.* 9. 15, 16, 18. 1 Cor. 10. 5.

2. Here is no more neceſſity then poſſibility of diſtinguiſhing between Elect and *non*-elect Infants; their being members of the viſible Church, gives them right to the priviledge of new admitted members.

3. Neither do we hold falling from the inward efficacy of grace, as from true ſolid Sanctification, Juſtification and Adoption, though we grant men may fall from the outward diſpenſation of the Covenant of grace and turn Apoſtates; or continue under the outward diſpenſation, and yet fall ſhort of the ſaving efficacy of grace. Yea moreover that thoſe which have ſeemed to themſelves and others to be Juſtified, Sanctified and Adopted, may fall from what they ſeemed to have, and utterly periſh. Ioh. 13. 1. 2 Pet. 2. 1. Rev. 3. 1, 7. Heb. 6. 4, 5, 6. Mat 25. 29.

4. The Objection will hold as ſtrongly againſt the baptizing of the profeſſours of faith, for not all thoſe whom the Apoſtles or any others baptized upon their profeſſion have held our, many proved wicked and reprobate, none can certainly diſtinguiſh among profeſſours, which are elect and which not, Muſt they not therefore be baptized?

To conclude therefore, They that by their own profeſſion, or Gods profeſſion for them, are diſcovered to have right to the outward diſpenſation of the Covenant, let them enjoy it without gainſaying; and let us leave the inward

efficacy of the Covenant to God, to whom alone it belongs.

Obj. 3. But what need you write so much in answering so little? It seems your cause is not good you take so much pains about it: Why did not you Answer as briefly as the other party Propounded?

Ans. 1. The truth oft lies deep and will not easily be found out: as it is more precious then gold and silver, so it requires more diligent search. Gold Mines are not obvious to every eye, much skill and labour are requisite to finde them out, and bring the gold to light. Pro. 3 13,14.

2. Though the other party have but briefly propounded their judgement, and grounds thereof in their now-Answered Papers; yet it is known what large discourses they have made amongst the people, and how many Treatises are written on this subject.

3. It is not an argument of a bad cause to be somewhat large in clearing it; the better the cause is, the more it deserves diligence in handling of it, least we should wrong God, his people and truth by sleightinesse. A cup of poison may be prepared, drunk down and dispersed into the body in an hour, which the wisest Physitian can hardly expell out of the body, with all his skill and pains in many moneths. A desperate cut-throat may give a wound or stab in a moment, which the most dexterous Chyrurgion cannot heal in a short time. An incendiary may set an whole Town on fire suddenly, which cannot be built up by many Carpenters and Masons in few years. Yet the cause and work of the later is much better then of the former. I have been willing therefore to be somewhat large, as my poor ability, small leisure, time allowed, and others importunity would permit.

H.H.J.Br. You conclude your Paper thus. *If you therefore or your Ministers have any thing to say or write herein, we desire you, for the truth and your promise sake, to do the same, else we must necessarily conclude, that neither you nor they have any thing to gainsay it, but by your silence justifie both our principle and practice.*

You see I hope by this time, that we have something to say and write herein, and for the truths and our promise sake have done the same in part, and are ready by the grace of Jesus Christ, to do more when duly called thereunto, therefore you have no cause to conclude that we have nothing to gainsay, or that by silence we do justifie your principle or practice, against which we have born witnesse in love to the truth.

And now Sirs, you which have subscribed the Papers here answered, let me intreat you seriously to peruse what hath been here returned to you in Answer, and acknowledge what is of God and agreeable to his truth; and if you finde any thing dissonant thereto, discover it and spare not, and let me have a punctual and particular reply to the several parts of this answer, and till then forbear your high confidence, in promoting your opinions and practising answerably, then will you give us good ground of perswasion, that your profession of desire to have the truth discussed is reall. But if you shall be unable to answer this (as I am perswaded you will not be able with any shew of truth) and yet proceed in your opinions and practice; let me tell you, God will be certainly avenged of those which abuse his people, ordinances and truth, speaking evil of the things they know not; if not with visible and temporal, yet certainly with invisible spiritual and eternal punishments: Reade I pray 2 *Tim.* the third Chapter. 2 *Pet.* 2. and the Epistle of *Jude*.

As

As for you, dear Brethren, that mourn for what you cannot amend, and endeavour to contend for the common ſalvation once delivered to the Saints, and not to be as children, carried about with every winde of vain doctrine, I exhort that you will hold faſt the truth which you have received, keep the word of Chriſts patience, that he may keep you in this hour of temptation that is befallen the whole world to try them that dwell on the earth. Be ſure that you receive the truth in love, knowing that many for want of this are given over to ſtrong deluſions to beleeve lies that they may be damned, becauſe they had pleaſure in unrighteouſneſſe. Remember the counſel of Chriſt and his Apoſtles in theſe following Scriptures, *Mat.* 7.15,16. *Rom.* 16.17,18. *Gal.* 5.1. 2 *Tim.* 3.1,2,3,4,5,6,7, *&c.* 2 *Pet.* 3.1,2. and 17.18. 1 *Joh.* 4.1,2. *Jude* 17, 18,19,20,21. Rev. 2.25. and 3.10.

Thus I have anſwered theſe Papers, hoping that I ſhall be ready by Gods aſſiſtance, to give a reaſon of my faith and hope herein, either by word or writing ſo far as I may have a good call thereto, may do it with ſafety, and may deal with men that will hear and ſpeak reaſon and Scripture pertinently applied, and may obſerve thoſe rules of the Apoſtle, 2 *Tim.* 2.16.23. *Tit.* 3. 9,10.

Thus deſiring that the God of truth will more and more clear his truth, and ſubdue thereto or break in pieces all the ignorant and wilfull oppoſers thereof, I end,

William Cooke.

FINIS.